THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF SKOPJE AND ITS LANGUAGE

BY
NICHOLAS P. ANDRIOTIS

SOCIETY FOR MACEDONIAN STUDIES
THESSALONIKI 1991

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ
ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF SCOPJE AND ITS LANGUAGE

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

Φωτομηχανική ἀνατύπωση
ἀπό τήν δεύτερη ἔκδοση, Ἀθήνα 1966

ISBN 960-7265-08-4

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ
ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

III - 112-8

THE FEDERATIVE REPUBLIC OF SKOPJE AND ITS LANGUAGE

BY
NICHOLAS P. ANDRIOTIS

SOCIETY FOR MACEDONIAN STUDIES
ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΗ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ, ΑΡ. 77
THESSALONIKI 1991

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ · ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ·

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ
-ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ-

26375

ΒΙΒΛ. ΕΙΣΑΓ.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ
-ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION Page

I. Who were the Ancient Macedonians? 9

II. The origins of the Slavs of the state of Skopje 11

III. What is the Macedonian language 12

IV. Some conclusions on the relationship of the Skopje dialect with the Serb and Bulgarian languages 16

V. How should the Skopje dialect be named 19

VI. The impact of the Greek language on the Slavic dialect of the state of Skopje 23

1. Words of daily use..... 25

A. Nouns 25

B. Adjectives 32

C. Verbs 33

D. Other parts of speech 36

Words with Northern Greek phonetic form 36

2. Words from the language of the Church and Education 36

Greek words which passed into the dialect from foreign languages .. 40

Foreign words which passed into the Skopje dialect from Greek..... 41

Influence on Grammar 43

Historical Conclusions from the impact of Greek on the Slavic language 43

VII. Impact of other languages on the dialect of the state of Skopje 44

VIII. A History of the linguistic idiom of the state of Skopje 45

IX. Contemporary literary movements in the Skopje dialect 47

X. Arguments put forward by the Slavs to support their claim on Greek Macedonia 54

A. The argument regarding the names «Macedonians-Macedonia» 54

B. The arguments of territorial and economic unity 56

C. The argument about the alleged Slavic character of the whole of Macedonia 58

D. The argument about the nationality of the inhabitants of Greek Macedonia today. 63

XI. The creation of claims against Greek Macedonia 71

POSTSCRIPT 78

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ · ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ·

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ
ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

INTRODUCTION

The People's Republic of Macedonia was founded in Skopje, on the 2nd August, 1944. *It is one of the states of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. It contains within its boundaries that part of Northern Macedonia which belonged to Servia in the past and which is inhabited to-day, according to the latest statistics, by 864,000 Slavophones, 164,000 Albanophones, 200,000 Turkophones, 10,000 Armenians, 9,000 Vlachophones, 20,000 Gypsies and many Greeks, especially in the urban centers, whose existence, however, official statistics choose to ignore.*[1]

The creation of the State of Skopje could have passed unnoticed as far as the Greek nation is concerned, had its sole objective been to govern its inhabitants and lead them to progress and civilisation. It is in fact of little interest to Greeks, whether the modern State of Yugoslavia, a major power in the Balkans and also a neighbour who is, potentially, a valuable friend, is divided into five or six federated republics. But the State of Skopje at the very moment of its birth, declared to the world that its sole raison d' être was to accomplish the following national objectives: Firstly to convince nations that its people, whom Bulgarians and Serbs alternately have claimed as their own fellow-countrymen, are neither Serbs nor Bulgarians, but a separate and distinct nation descended from the ancient Macedonians, who have inhabited that country for four thousand years and can therefore rightfully claim to be called Macedonians and have the country they inhabit called Macedonia, pure and simple.

Secondly, to convince other nations that its people qua *Macedonians can rightfully regard the country as their national patrimony and are entitled to regard as unredeemed parts of Macedonian territory the whole of the area which in antiquity was called Macedonia and which lies to-day beyond the border of the State of Skopje: namely, not only the Slavophone district of Pirin Macedonia which is to-day part of Bulgarian territory but also Greek Macedonia which they insist on calling «Aegean Macedonia». This national mission which the State of Skopje has set itself, has rendered its existence and every political move made by it of capital importance to us. It imposes upon us the necessity, both as a State and as a nation, to keep a constant watch on whatever it does.*

Since every Greek should become fully acquainted with the facts about this new State, I have ventured to analyse below the linguistic, ethnological and historic development of its people and set forth the means it employs in its effort to achieve its expansionist aims at our expense.

1. Statistics do not agree. In his recent study entitled «Il Macedonico» published in the periodical Paedeia, Rivista letteraria di Informazione Bibliografica, Vol. 12 (1957) page 249, the Italian linguist Vittori Pesari gives the following figures: 800.000 Slavophones, 200.000 Albanophones and 95.000 Turcophones.

ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΟΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

CHAPTER I

WHO WERE THE ANCIENT MACEDONIANS?

One of the ways whereby the State of Skopje has tried to establish a link between the people of that country and the ancient Macedonians, is the use of the name «Macedonians» «Macedonia» which it has purposely adopted as its own. It is therefore important to summarize below the well-known history of that ethnological term.

The ancient Macedonians, as all serious and objective historians agree today, were one of the ancient Hellenic tribes like the Ionians, the Dorians and the Aeolians, with a special dialectal affinity to the last two. From Western Macedonia, which was their earliest place of abode, they spread gradually eastwards and northwards. They drove back or assimilated the neighbouring Illyrian and Thracian tribes and established in this process their control over the area which the ancient geographers called «Macedonia». Their language exhibits all the basic features of ancient Greek and differs in every important respect from the ancient Illyrian and Thracian languages. In common with Greek, for example, it transformed the Indo-European *s* to aspiration, silenced the Indo-European *u*, differentiated the Indo-European gutturolabial consonants in accordance with the nature of the following vowel, changed the Indo-European final *m* into *n* and silenced all the final consonants with the exception of *N*, *R*, *S*; all of these features being unknown to the Thracian-Illyrian language. In common with Greek, it moreover belongs to the *centum* language group and not to the *satem* group to which the Thracian-Illyrian belongs, in so far as the mutations of palatial guttural consonants are concerned. Its vocabulary also is Greek. The most common or better known Macedonian names were Greek without exception: Alexander, Amyntas, Antioch, Archelaos, Cassander, Parmenion, Perdicas, Polysperchon, Ptolemy, Seleucos, Philip, Arsinoe, Berenice, Thessaloniki, Cleopatra, Olympias, etc. There are no Thracio-Illyrian names. The more important place names are also Greek: Aegae, Aliacmon, Arnissa, Veroia, Eidomeni, Orestis, Pella, etc. The names of months are Greek: Dios, Apellaios, Avdnaios, Peritios, Dystros, Xandikos, Artemisios, Daisios, Panaimos,

Loios, Gorpiaios, Hyperberetaios. Everything is Greek. Nothing is Thracio-Illyrian.

Throughout the period of antiquity, the Macedonians remained faithfully attached to Greek destinies and regarded it as their perpetual mission to defend the Hellenic nation. Polybius the historian wrote:

> «The Macedonians deserve honour, for most of the time they do not cease fighting against the barbarians for the security of the Greeks». (IX, 35)

As the rear-guard of the Greeks in the Balkan peninsula at first, they fought and repelled the Thracio-Illyrians. As the leaders of the Greek nation later on, they defeated its traditional enemy, the Persians, and brought the Greek language and civilisation to the countries of the East. From the 5th century B.C. onwards, the Macedonians established the Attic dialect, which was spoken in Athens, as their official language. It is in this that they educated their children and read the masterpieces of the Greek philosophers and poets. It is this the language they used for the dissemination of the ancient Greek civilisation to the whole of the ancient world. Its universality is their achievement.[2] «For Macedonia is Greece» as Strabo wrote.[2a] Thus, when our contemporary Slav neighbours have recourse to history of ancient Macedonians, when they circulate national propagandist pamphlets about their Kings, e.g. about Alexander the Great,[2b] when they name their various political or athletic societies «*Aleksandar Makedonski*» they should, as proud Slavs, feel some shame in the face of world history.

---

2. *G. Hatzidakis*: Du caractère héllenique des anciens Macédoniens (Athènes, 1896), *G. Hatzidakis*: Zur Abstammung der alten Makedonier (Athen, 1897), *G. Hatzidakis:* Zur Ethnologie der alten Makedonier - Indogerm. Forsch. II, 1900, pp. 314 ff., *O. Hoffmann:* Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum (Göttingen, 1906), *G. Hatzidakis:* Περὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ τῶν Ἀρχαίων Μακεδόνων, Glossikai Meletai 1, 33 ff., *G. Hatzidakis:* Καὶ πάλιν περὶ τοῦ ἑλληνισμοῦ τῶν Ἀρχ. Μακεδ. University Year-book, 1911, pp. 87 ff., A. *D. Keramopoulos*: Ἀρχαιοὶ καὶ Δωριεῖς ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ, Ellinika 2 (1928) 105-115, *A. D. Keramopoulos*: Μακεδονία καὶ Μακεδόνες (Athens, 1930), *P. N. Andriotis*: Ἡ γλῶσσα καὶ ἡ ἑλληνικότητα τῶν Ἀρχ. Μακεδόνων (Thessaloniki, 1952), *G. N. Kalleris*: Les anciens Macédoniens. Etude linguistique et historique, Vol. I (Athens, 1954).

2a. *Strabo*: Geographica II, 455 (Ed. Meinecke).

2b. See *Slavomir Nastasijevic*: Aleksandar Makedonski (Beograd 1961) Vol. 2.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

CHAPTER II

THE ORIGINS OF THE SLAVS OF THE STATE OF SKOPJE

During the Hellenistic age, the Roman era and the early centuries of the Byzantine period, the Balkan peninsula was inhabited by pure Greeks and by hellenised Thracio-Illyrians. Until the 7th century A. D. the boundaries of the Greek-speaking world in the Balkans extended, in the north, to the mouth of the river Genysos on the Adriatic Sea, south of Skopje, and from Serdica (Sofia) along the Aemos range to the Black Sea. North of that line, the predominant language during antiquity was Thracio-Illyrian; late in the Roman era and during the early years of the Byzantine empire Latin was widely used. The Slavs who had lived in Eastern Poland and White Russia in the past, began to move southwards, half-way through the 6th century A. D. At first they followed other barbarian invaders, the Avars in particular, as mercenaries, returning each time with their booty to their bases north of the Danube. In the beginning of the 7th century,[3] at a time when domestic troubles weakened the defenses at the northern frontier of the Byzantine State, they made their earliest settlement between the Danube and the Aemos range. From then onwards, Slavic invasions were carried on intermittently and Slavic penetrations of the northern parts of the Balkan peninsula continued either in the form of war-like invasions and the capture of Greeks when the Byzantine armies were fighting on other fronts, or by the peaceful settlement of Slavic peasants and shepherds when those invaders submitted to Byzantine rule.

The Slavic language began thus to spread very gradually to northern Macedonia. It was brought to that area, a) by the Slavic peasants and slaves whom the Byzantine landlords introduced for the purpose of cultivating their fields, b) by Greek prisoners of the Bulgarians who bought themselves out of captivity and returned home after having learnt the Slavic language, and c) by the Greeks of Macedonia who came into contact with Slavophones and learnt

3. *D. Zakynthinos*: Οἱ Σλαῦοι ἐν Ἑλλάδι, p. 27.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ · ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ · ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ

their simple language with relative ease, whilst those were unable to master Greek, a considerably more difficult language.

However, Greek remained the predominant language in Macedonia during the Middle Ages, because the urban population of the country remained Greek. It was during the years of the Turkish rule that the Slavic population grew, as a result of the practice which the Turkish landlords had inherited from their Byzantine predecessors, of bringing in Slavic serfs to cultivate their estates. This gradual Slavisation during the Byzantine and Turkish periods, however, was limited to northern Macedonia. It did not extend southwards to those areas which now form part of the Greek territory. There the Hellenic element, centered around Thessaloniki which had never been exposed to Slavic penetration, was so strong both during the Middle Ages and in the period of Turkish rule that the few Slavs who penetrated from time to time, could not resist assimilation.[4]

The Slavs of the newly founded State of Skopje have never - except for a very brief period under the Bulgar Czar Samuel - been able to attain independent statehood. Through the centuries, they have been governed by the Byzantines, the Bulgarians, the Serbs and the Turks. In recent years, the State of Skopje constituted a province of Serbia which Bulgaria claimed and continued even after it had been proclaimed a federative state of Yugoslavia in 1944, to claim as her own, as part, in fact, of the Macedonia of Pirin which remains a province of Bulgaria.

CHAPTER III

WHAT IS THE «MACEDONIAN LANGUAGE»

The language spoken by the majority of the people of the State of Skopje which they have quite arbitrarily called «Macedonian», is a Slavic dialect so closely resembling Bulgarian and Serbian, that according to linguistic principles it can hardly be considered an independent language at a par with the other two. The only defi-

---

4. *K. I. Amantos*: Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν μεσαιωνικὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ ἐθνολογίαν τῆς Μακεδονίας (Athens, 1920), *St. Kyriakidis*: Ὁ μακεδονικὸς ἑλληνισμὸς καὶ ὁ μεσώτερος (Athens 1926), *St. Kyriakidis*: Βούλγαροι καὶ Σλαῦοι εἰς τὴν ἑλλ. ἱστορίαν (Thessaloniki, 1946).

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

nite boundaries of this Slavic dialect are set by the Greek language. They broadly coincide with the Yugoslav-Greek frontier except for a small enclave which that dialect forms on Greek territory in the mountainous regions north of Kastoria. In the West, that Slavic dialect borders on the Albanian language, but, in this case, the linguistic frontier does not coincide with the national Albanian-Yugoslavian border; for the State of Skopje counts among its inhabitants, 164,000 Albanian-speaking people.

The linguistic frontier on the Serb and Bulgarian sides are lost in the fluidity of equally divided linguistic groups on either side and are impossible to determine. The so-called «Macedonian» dialect is, in fact, an intermediate stage between Bulgarian and Serb. As one moves towards Bulgaria, the Serb elements grow rarer while the Bulgarian elements multiply and vice versa. For that reason, just as the Skopje region was the apple of discord between the politicians of Bulgaria and Servia, so its language has become an object of dispute. Serbian linguists stress its affinities with the Serb language; Bulgarians emphasize its similarities with Bulgarian. Both are anxious to prove that it is really an extension of their respective languages.

Viewed objectively, the situation appears as follows.

1. Differences in relation to the ancient Slav language.

The phonetic differences of the dialect spoken in the State of Skopje in relation to the ancient Slav language are as follows:

1. It has changed the vowel known as «big ger» (Z) into *O*, e.g. *SZN* into SON. (This change has taken place in Russian, but not in Bulgarian - with the exception, in the latter, of some endings which show this change.)

2. It has changed the vowel known as «small ger» (b) into *e*. (The same change has taken place in Russian and, in some cases, in Bulgarian.)

3. It has changed the nasal vowel $\overline{\text{ϖ}}$ (=on) into *a*. (The same change has taken place in some central idioms of the Bulgarian language.)

4. It has inserted an *a* in a number of consonantal complexes, e.g. dobar instead of dobr. (The same development can be observed in Serbo-Croat.)

5. It has altered the consonantal complexes tj and Kt into K before the vowels *e* and *i*. (A similar alteration has taken place in Serbo-Croat.)

6. It has changed the consonantal complex dj into g.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

7. It has changed the vowel form *l* into *ol*, e.g. *tolt* instead of *tlt*. (The same change has taken place in Russian.)

8. It has changed the initial vowel ѧ (=je) into ja. (A similar change has taken place in certain Serbo-Croat idioms and in Czechoslovak.)

9. It has changed the consonantal complex *čr* into *cr*, e.g. *črn* (= black) - *crn* (The same change may be observed in Serbo-Croat.)

2. Similarities with the Serb language

The Slavic dialect spoken in the State of Skopje shows the following similarities with the Serb language:

1. Both change the ancient Slavic *ty* into *č* whilst Bulgarian changes it into *št*, e.g. the ancient Slavic svěšta (= sister) has become sveča, as in Serb, whilst in Bulgarian it is svešt. The ancient slavic nošt (= night) has become noč as in Serb, whilst in Bulgarian it has retained its original form nošt etc.

2. It has changed the ancient Slavic form *žd* into ǵ and dj (in Serb, only into dj), whilst Bulgarian has retained the form *žd* e.g. the ancient Slavic and modern Bulgarian word *meždu* (= between) has become *medju* in the dialect spoken in the State of Skopje, as in Serb.

3. It retains the accent on the antepenult. E.g. Vodénisa (= Watermill), vodénitsar (= Miller) - plural vodenítsari with an article, vodenítsa-ta, Sínovi (Sons)with the article Sinóvi-te whilst in Bulgarian the accent is freely placed.[5]

4. It changes the gerundial ending *-ki* into *ći*, whilst in Bulgarian, the same ending is *-šte*.

5. It uses the same form of auxiliary verb ќе for the formation of the future as in Serb, whereas in Bulgarian the form *šte* is employed.

6. It uses the same relative *on* as the Serb language.

7. It uses the same indicative pronoun for proximate objects *ov* as employed in Serb.

8. The system of possessive pronouns in the third person corresponds to the Serb not the Bulgarian equivalent.

On those similarities with the Serb language, the Serb linguists Belič and Iv. Ivanovič base their claim that the dialect spoken in

---

5. *St. Mladenov*: Geschichte der bulgarischen Sprache (Berlin-Leipzig para. 195, pp. 394 ff.),

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

the State of Skopje is an ancient branch of the Serb language which subsequently was slightly influenced by the Bulgarian language.

3. Common features with the Bulgarian language.

Apart, however, from the features which the dialect spoken in the State of Skopje possesses in common with Serb, there are other more numerous, and more important characteristics which that dialect shares with Bulgarian and which are unknown in Serb. These are as follows:

1. The reduction of case endings of nouns to three only, the Nominative, the Dative and the Accusative which further tend to be effectively limited to one. The Serb language, by contrast, has preserved 7 different case endings.

2. The use of prefixes for the formation of the comparative and the superlative degrees, e.g. rano (= early), po-rano (earlier). In Serb, by contrast, suffixes are used for that purpose, e.g. ran-ije.

3. The obsolescence of the infinitive, still used in Serb.

4. The transformation of the indicative pronoun masc. - *ot*, fem. *ta*, neut. *to* into an article which follows the nouns as e.g. in angel-ot (the angel) žena-ta (the woman), šelo-to (the village), plural angelite, ženi-te, selá-ta and the use of a triple article, e.g. maz-ot (= man), maz-ou (the man here), maz-on (= the man there). The last two *ou* and *on* characterise the Skopje dialect only.

(The appended article is common in Albanian, Rumanian, the Scandinavian languages and Armenian.)

5. The accent of words is dynamic, as in Bulgarian, whilst in Serb it is musical.

6. As in Bulgarian, an identical ending -i was retained for both masculine and feminine plurals, whereas in Serb the ending -*e*)-*e* was generally adopted in feminine nouns.

7. The third person plural ends in -at. This is also the case in Bulgarian but not in Serb where it ends in -u.

8. It uses the interrogative pronoun *Koj* (= which) instead of *Kto* (=who). However, the same substitution is found in several other Balkan languages including Modern Greek.

9. Like Bulgarian, it uses the form *ni-* for the pronoun "*we*".

10. It uses the aggregative ending *-mina* which is also used in Bulgarian.

11. It contains a large number, probably thousands, of Greek

words. This is also true of Bulgarian but not of Serb which has very few.

Syntax does not throw much light on the relation of the Skopje dialect with either the Bulgarian or the Serb languages. Common forms can be found very widely in the languages spoken by the peoples of the Balkan peninsula which makes them a suitable subject for a comparative study of Balkan languages, but also makes it impossible to opine with any certainty about their derivations.

4. Peculiarities of the dialect spoken in the State of Skopje.

The features of that dialect which are absent both from the Serb and from the Bulgarian languages are as follows:

1. that dialect alone forms the first person singular of all verbs with the termination *-am.*

2. the use of a composite verb form using the auxiliary verb *imam* (= I have) with the neuter of the past participle, e.g. *imam videno* (= I have it seen) meaning " I have seen it".[6]

CHAPTER IV

SOME CONCLUSIONS ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE SKOPJE DIALECT WITH THE SERB AND BULGARIAN LANGUAGES

From what has been said, it follows that the Slavic dialect spoken in the State of Skopje has fewer, mainly phonetic similarities with Serb and more, mainly morphological affinities with the Bulgarian language. The appended article should be especially mentioned in this connection. Where does it belong then? It is certainly not part of the Serb language. But neither can it be completely identified with Bulgarian. It is, according to A. Vaillant, a dialect whose genealogy makes it part of the *Bulgaro-Macedonian* group, a group which must be distinguished from the Serbo-Croatian linguistic group. Its origins can be traced to the Slavic dialect spoken in Northern Macedonia during the 9th and 10th centuries, into which Methodius and Cyrillus

---

6. *H. G. Lunt*: Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language (Skopje, 1952) p. 7 Cf. *Bl. Koneski*, Istorija na Makedonskiot jazik (Skopje 1965), Introduction, pp. 7-15.

translated the Holy Script. Its affinities with Serb are neither genealogical nor indeed very old. They are due to the impact brought to bear upon it much later by the Serb language at the time when the Dusan conquests brought Macedonia within Serbian territory. The country was then administered by local Serb rulers and by clergymen of the Patriarchate of Peč and not only did the State use Serb as the official language but the Church also introduced the Serb-like form of ecclesiastical Slavonic.[7] This Serb linguistic impact was continued during the years of Turkish occupation when Serb, together with Greek and Turkish, was one of the three official languages in the Turkish administrative district of Northern Macedonia. But for this late impact, the similarities between Bulgarian and the Skopje dialect would have been greater and the differences smaller than they are today.

The view that the Skopje dialect belongs to the Bulgaro-Macedonian group and not to the Serbo-Croat group is summed up in A. Meillet, M. Cohen "Les Langues du Monde" p. 66, in the following words:

"En Macédoine la majorité des parlers est nettement de type bulgare avec forte serbisation." This is also the view of Horace Lunt who prefers to give it the name "Eastern Balkan Slavic"[8] rather than Bulgaro-Macedonian. The difference between a Slavic Macedonian dialect and literary Bulgarian is much smaller than that which, according to V. Pisani (Il Macedonico, Paedeia 12, 1957, p. 250) separates the Emilian dialects from written Italian. Those who maintain that the idiom in question belongs to the Serb tongue are much farther from objective truth than those who join A. Vaillant and H. Lunt in supporting the view that this idiom should rather be classed with the Bulgarian language.

There are adepts, however, of the theory that neither its few—mainly phonetic — common features with Serb nor those more numerous morphological features which it shares with Bulgarian, are sufficient to destroy the separate identity of the Skopje dialect which prevents it from being confused with either of these two languages and enforces the view that it constitutes a distinct and separate Slav language. This theory is propounded by Jagić, Golubinski, Triniegorski, Pavloski,

---

7. *St. Mladenov* ref. p. 52, *H. G. Lunt* p. 6.

8. *H. L. Lunt*, p. 6, see also *A. Vaillant*: «Grammaire comparée des langues slaves» (Paris 1915).

ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

Draganof, Brailsford. The controversy is summarised by Van Vijk in his book "Les Langues Slaves, de l' unité à la pluralité" (Paris 1937), p. 119-126.

Any judgment on the merits of that theory must depend, necessarily, on an objective definition of what constitutes a separate language. And such a definition can only be based on the science of linguistics which admits of no political considerations. If the separate identity of a linguistic form as a language —as distinct from a dialect or idiom— must depend, as compared with related linguistic forms, on differences perhaps not so great as those which distinguish e.g. Greek from other sister Indo-European languages —e.g. Latin or Germanic— but at least differences as substantial as those which exist between particularly related languages, as French and Italian for instance, or German and Swedish, or Russian and Bulgarian, then the linguistic idiom spoken in Skopje cannot possibly be called a language on its own right. Only if, for political expediency, in order to provide a basis for an autonomous State, the science of linguistics were to be revised and new definitions of the term "language" devised, so that the latter could be taken to mean much smaller and insignificant differences between related linguistic forms, only then could the Slav idiom of the State of Skopje be called a language. In that case, however, a radical re-drawing of the world's linguistic map would be necessary and each of the known languages would have to be subdivided into several others. Modern Greek, for instance, whose regional differences sometimes exceed in importance those which separate the Skopje dialect from Bulgarian, but which nonetheless is still considered by all linguists as a single language, would have to be divided into several "languages": the Tsakonic, the lower Italian, the Pontiac, the Cappadocian etc. The adepts of the separate identity of the Skopje dialect either overestimate exceedingly its insignificant particular features, and underestimate its significant affinities with the Bulgarian language (which enable anyone who knows the latter to understand the former without any difficulty) or do something far worse: They pretend to speak in the name of science in order to cover up political ambitions.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

CHAPTER V

HOW SHOULD THE SKOPJE DIALECT BE NAMED

However we may regard it, be it as a branch of Serb, or as a dialect of Bulgarian or even as a separate language, this Slavic linguistic entity, which was made official by the State of Skopje, needs to be given a name and this name, at least as far as the linguistic science is concerned, should correspond as closely as possible, to reality.

Before the Panslavic propaganda imposed upon them the name "Macedonian", the Slavophones of the State of Skopje who account for two thirds of its inhabitants, called themselves *Bugari*, i.e. Bulgarians. "Bugari" is the Serbian form of the national term "Bulgarians", which proves the fact that the Serbs—whatever they may argue today in order to justify the incorporation of that small territory into Yugoslavia, — always regarded its people not as Serbs, but as Bulgarians. "Bugari est justement le nom ethnique des slaves macédoniens" writes A. Vaillant who studied, more especially, the problem of their language.[9] The Slavs of Northern Macedonia themselves attached the name "Bulgarian" to their dialect when, for the sake of preserving the folklore, attempts were started in the middle of the last century to collect the popular songs of that region: "Bulgarski narodni pěsni" was the title which the brothers Miladinov gave to the collection that was published in Zagreb in 1861. The term "Macedonian" had not been invented yet. "Bulgarians" were they called by the Greeks of Macedonia and "Bulgarian" was their dialect termed, as is shown by the 16th century "Macedonian Dictionary", a glossary of 301 Slavic words and phrases that were current in the region of Kastoria. The translation of those words and phrases, which were spelled in Greek letters, into Greek was the work of an anonymous Greek of the area. It has been re-edited recently by C. Giannelli and A. Vaillant.[10] But how could the Yugoslavs forever retain within their territory, a people the majority of which call

---

9. *A. Vaillant*: Le problème du Slave Macédonien, Bull. Soc. Ling. 39 (1938) p. 205.

10. *G. Giannelli - A. Vaillant*: Un lexique macédonien du XVIe siècle, Textes publiés par l' Institut des Études Slaves. -V. (Paris 1958) p. 23.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ - ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

themselves by the national name "Bulgarian"? And how could they encourage or allow a part of the "Bulgarian" people to claim Greek Macedonia provisionally for itself, but in the long run for Bulgaria? Thus they found it expedient to indulge in what the Bulgarian nationalists themselves have practised of old, namely they had the national name "Bugari" the only name that has ethnological meaning and the only one used by the people of the State of Skopje itself, considered by their politicians and scientists as practically non-existant and substituted in its place a newly-coined one, the name "Macedonians". This name, incidentally, was brought into use by Russian Panslavist propaganda at the end of the nineteenth century.

It has already been shown that the Slavs of the Balkan peninsula never in history came into contact with the ancient Macedonians. When the Slavs made their appearance in the Greek Peninsula, the Macedonians, in common with the other Hellenic tribes; the Dorians, the Ionians, the Aeolians, had merged their identity in the wider world of the Alexandrian, the Roman and the early Byzantine eras. From then onwards, the term "Macedonia" had a purely geographical significance and no ethnological context. It would have been absurd to call by the name of Dorians any of the Slavs who invaded the Greek peninsula for the first time during the Middle Ages, had they happened to settle in an area which had been Doric in antiquity; or by the name of Ionians those who might have established themselves in an ancient Ionian land. For similar reasons, there is no sense in calling "Macedonians" these Slavs who established themselves in the part of the country where the Macedonians had lived in ancient times, quite apart from the fact that the Slavs in question not only retain their Slavic consciousness but also name themselves "Bugari". Though common among the Greeks as a geographical expression both in the Byzantine era and during the Turkish rule, the terms "Macedonia" and "Macedonians" were completely unknown to the Slavs until modern Panslav propaganda grabbed at these precious findings and brought them into current use.[10a]

The language of a Slavophone people which calls itself Bulgarian, a language, moreover, shown to be nothing but a dialect of Bulgarian, would, according to the rules of reason and history, be called Bulgarian or if not that, Slavonic or even Northern Macedonian Slavic. Those names, however, do not promote the Skopje politicians' ambitions of

10a *N. P. Andriotis*: History of the name «Macedonia». Balkan Studies 1 (1960) pp. 147 ff.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

territorial expansion beyond the line where the Slavophones and the large, compact, Greek population of Macedonia begins. Hence they preferred the terms "Macedonians", "Macedonia", "Macedonian language" which know no such barriers, but extend up to Mount Olympus, across the Pindus range and down to the seas of the Aegean.

Once those terms were established by the Yugoslavs, they were soon uncritically accepted by many foreign "objective scholars" with no less ease and blissful unconcern than that of a blind man walking down a straight path. Die Volksrepublik Mazedonien (=Macedonian People's Republic), das Mazedonische(=the Macedonian language), write the Germans. Il Macedonico, write the Italians. The Republic of Macedonia, the Macedonian language, write the Americans. Le Slave Macédonien writes the Frenchman A. Vaillant, with somewhat greater discretion.[11] The name "Macedonia" became so tightly gripped by Slav propaganda that even the Greeks both as individuals and as official authorities, in referring to this Slavic state and its language, proved unable to avoid this terminology and have come to use, in speech and writing, the terms Slavomacedonian language and Slavomacedonian people.

No one has ever thought of denoting the Bulgarian as Slavo-Byzantines, or Slavo-Thracians or Slavo-Greeks. Nor are the Yugoslavs known as Slavo-Illyrians. There is, accordingly, no justification for the name "Macedonian" or Slavomacedonian which the Bugari of the State of Skopje have sought to appropriate. But for their ambitions to annex and assimilate Greek territories and populations —in the twentieth century!— they would either have stuck by their national name "Bugari" which is most appropriate both from the historical and the ethnological point of view, or they would, like other peoples, have contrived to discover in their Slavic tradition a name in keeping with their na-

---

11. The Belgian *Arnold van Gennep*, Traité comparatif des nationalités» - (Paris 1922), Vol. I, pp. 212-215 writes on this subject as follows: «Macedonia does not exist either as a state or as a territory of one nationality, but merely as a geographical term». Also the Swiss *W. Stahlin* writes: «First of all it must be made clear that Macedonia as a whole is simply a geographical region. A Macedonian race does not exist. There is no Macedonian people. In Greek Macedonia all people without exception speak Greek». And the Czechoslovak *J. S. Roucek*, («Bulgaria and the Menace of Macedonia's Independence», p. 6) *says:* «The Macedonian nationality is completely non-existant. It is a thing existing only in the praises of Bulgarian Komitadji». See *Ch. Naltsas*: Τὸ μακεδονικὸν ζήτημα καὶ ἡ σοβιετικὴ πολιτική, (Thessaloniki, 1954) pp. 516, 519 ff.

tional origins. Whether we like it or not, Macedonia to-day is mere a geographic expression. As a linguistic or ethnological term, it h ceased to exist. Already in antiquity, by the free association of Heller tribes, Macedonia was merged in the wider world of Hellas. With t Slavic invasion, during the Middle Ages it was permanently divid into two zones: the Slavic and the Greek. The Northern part of M cedonia is inhabited by Slavs, old or new, Slavic languages are spok in it, it belongs to Slavic States. The Southern part is inhabited by Greel it speaks the Greek language and has for a very long time formed pa of the State of Greece, on the basis of international treaties. It has n been preserved for Greece by the benevolence of a generous don but through the sacrifice of the people of Greece who freed it from t Turks who had taken it away not from a Slavic country but from Greek, Byzantine state. Whose language then, is this Macedonian to gue? Is it the language of the Greeks of Southern Macedonia or th of the Slavs of the Northern part of it? If the Greeks themselves, wi little regard for reason or reality, decided —with more right than t Slavs— to proclaim their Greek speech as the "Macedonia language and turn Greek Macedonia into a State federated with Greece, whic then of the two opposite states of Macedonia and which of the tw unrelated Macedonian languages would the objective, unbiased an unprejudiced arbiters of nationalities accept as valid? The Macedoni which to this day speaks Greek, i.e. the language the ancient Mac donians spoke when they ruled over and civilized the Balkans an the world at large, which Medieval Macedonians spoke when the drove back the Slavic invaders, and which the modern Greek Mac donians speak who gave their blood to liberate the earth of their fa thers from the Turkish conquerors, that is that Macedonia which i still the abode of the Macedonia nation —an abode never reache by Slav late arrivals and that continues to this day its own and onl conceivable linguistic and ethnological tradition? Or that other Mac donia which to-day speaks Slavic, a language unknown at the time whe the term "Macedonian" acquired its significance as the name of language and a people? A language brought to Macedonia by people that were enemies and strangers to the Macedonian nation and history

The answer to this question is best left to the conscience of the fai and objective critic.

Not only under the present conditions of ethnic and political clea vage is the concept of a "Macedonian language" completely out o place. Even in the hypothetical circumstance of a unification of the

two Macedonias, the Slavic and the Greek, into a single state, the use of that appellation would be totally inappropriate.

No one has seriously claimed that the language spoken in Switzerland is Swiss —not German, French and Italian. Both French and Flemish are spoken in Belgium. But no one would think of talking of a "Belgian language". For similar reasons the mention of a "Macedonian language" in a country where close to 2.000.000 people would speak Greek and only 800.000 the Slavic dialect which has now received the blessing of the Skopje government, would be equally absurd.

Of course, it does not pertain to foreigners to decide on the official name of the State of Skopje and its language. It is their right and their duty, however, to regard the term "Macedonia" "Macedonians" and "Macedonian language" when used with reference to Slavs as arbitrary and unfounded from both the historical and the ethnological points of view. For us Greeks, in particular, it is proper and right that we should never accept the establishment of those names in either our official or our unofficial terminology either in regard to that State or in regard to its language. For us, as for any objective student, the name which is least offensive and closest to reality is the "Slavic dialect of the State of Skopje".

CHAPTER VI

THE IMPACT OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE ON THE SLAVIC DIALECT OF THE STATE OF SKOPJE

In the case of the Skopje dialect, as with the other languages of the Balkan peninsula, the language which more than any other influenced its development was Greek. The continuous uninterrupted neighbourhood with Greece, permanent cultural contacts with its people, the long Byzantine administration, and the Greek Orthodox Church left their mark on the Slavs of that region whilst the fact that a not inconsiderable part of its population are assimilated Greeks explains the large number of Greek linguistic elements which penetrated from time to time and were finally incorporated in the Slavic dialect of Skopje.

Those Greek linguistic elements are so numerous that they led a number of Greek scholars, who formerly studied the idiom, to think

ΚΕΝΤΡΟ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

that it was a Greek dialect with Slavic admixtures.[12] It should be added to their defense that the scholars in question were not linguists and did not know that the character of a language is determined not by its vocabulary but by its grammar.

However, the very large number and the semantical content of words of Greek origin in this idiom exceed by far the measure of legitimate influence by any one language even that of a nation of superior culture, on neighbouring languages and suggest that something more than normal cultural influence is here involved. For it is not only a question of judiciary, administrative, military or ecclesiastical terms such as hartofilaks, panipersevast, sevastokrator, archierei, ikona, metanija, efharistija, which the Balkan Slavs, not unexpectly, borrowed from the dominant Byzantine State. Not only of words of educational content (daskal, gramatik, kondil, filosof), not only of ancient Greek words which have become international scientific terms and are indirectly taken up by all neophyte nations through modern European languages (apopleksija, epilepsija, diplomatica, politika). The great majority of these borrowed Greek words are expressive of elementary notions and items of everyday life which no people is known to borrow from other nations, for it is hardly conceivable that it ever lacked such words of its own or, that it could ever forget them and replace them by foreign terms.

It is hardly conceivable that the Slavs of Northern Macedonia had no words of their own for such basic things as: courtyard, branch, fountain, saddle-bag, road, giddiness, jealousy, couple, courage, hut, bone, piece, oil, dirt, meadow, sheep-pen, bride, father-in-law, spleen, boundary, frying-pan, table, upside-down, simple, free, cheap, to like, to take, to confuse, to empty, to win, to miss, to entice, to smell, to suffer, to play, to stop, to mould, to save, to honour, to pick, to be guilty, to arrive, to give, to build and so many others. The borrowing of such words can only be explained by the fact that northern Macedonia, completely Greek-speaking in the ancient, Alexandrian, Roman,and medieval periods as evidenced by history and archaeology, was very slowly assimilated by the Slavs who from time to time and in successive waves invaded the country. It seems that the Greeks prior to their

12. *K. Tsiourkas*: Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν διγλωσσίαν τῶν Μακεδόνων (Athens (1907), *G. Georgiadis*: Τὸ μιξόγλωσσον ἐν Μακεδονία ἰδίωμα καὶ ἡ ἐθνολογικὴ κατάστασις τῶν ὁμιλούντων τοῦτο, (Edessa (1948) Cf. *P. Skok*, Byzance comme centre d' irradiation pour les mots latins dans les langues balcaniques. Byzantion 6, 371-378, *Bl. Koneski*, Istorija na Makedonskiot jazik, (Skopje 1965), p. 184.

Slavisation went through a stage of bilingualism during which they spoke both Greek and Slav. That stage enabled them to keep in their new language part of the treasure of vocabulary of their old national tongue.

For the full appreciation of the profound influence of Greek vocabulary on the language of the state of Skopje, it is important to give the reader the commonest Greek words to be found in the dialect of Skopje in their Slavic and Greek form, divided into grammatical categories. First of all I will give those words whose meaning shows that the Slavs borrowed from the Greeks in the midst of whom they lived without the intercession of the Greek ecclesiastical administration or education and culture.

I will then list the words with which their language was enriched through the Greek language of the Church, the Schools, and the State during the Byzantine era, the Turkish occupation and the modern period.

1. Words of Daily Use.

A. Nouns

avlija	αὐλὴ	courtyard
adamant	ἀδάμας-αντος	diamond
akola	κόλλα	paste
aktapod	χταπόδι	octopus
ambis	ἄβυσσος	abyss
angarija	ἀγγαρεία	forced labour
andart	ἀντάρτης	insurgent
armas	ἅρμωσις (ἀρραβὼν)	betrothal
armasnik	ἁρμοστὸς (μνηστὴρ)	betrothed
armasnitsa	ἁρμοστὴ (μνηστὴ)	fiancée
aroma	ἄρωμα	aroma
aspida	ἀσπίδα	shield
astma	ἄσθμα	asthma
bisagi	δισάκκι	saddle-bag
vjasanie	βιάση	hurry
vrakozun	βρακοζώνη	belt
vris	βρύση	spring, fountain
vroma	βρῶμα	filth
gargara	γαργάρα	gargle
gnida	κόνιδα	nit

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

gramota	γράμματα	letters
darmon	δερμόνι	sieve
dafine, dofina	δάφνη	laurel
dekar	δεκάρι	the ten, a surface measure,
dekara	δεκάρα	a tenpenny coin
dekalepto	δεκάλεπτο	ten minutes period
dikel	δικέλι	double-pointed mattock
dilav	διλάβι	tongs
dipla	δίπλα	fold
disagi disasi	δισάκκι	saddle-bag
disk	δίσκος	disc, tray
dodekada	δωδεκάδα	a dozen (the elders)
drum	δρόμος	way
dunia	κυδώνι	quince
ergatin, argatin	ἐργάτης	workman
eftinija	εὐθήνεια, φτήνεια	cheapness
ehidna	ἔχιδνα	viper
zalis	ζάλη	giddiness
zevgar, zegvar, sevgar	ζευγάρι	pair
zilia	ζήλεια	jealousy
zograf, zugraf	ζωγράφος	painter
zunitsa	ζώνη	belt
ile	ἔλαιον	oil
ilikija	ἡλικία	age
ilinika	ἑλληνικὰ —	Greek language
imarmena, armen	εἱμαρμένη	fate, destiny
jagurida, jagurina	ἀγγουρίδα	unripe grape
kada	κάδος	tab, bucket
kalam	καλάμι	cane, pen
kalamot	καλαμωτὴ	hedge
kalezba	κάλεσμα	invitation
kalek	καλὸς	beloved, beau, bridegroom
(a)kalesarmitsa	καλέστρα	she who invites
kalimana	καλιμάννα	god -mother
kalitata	νουνὸς	god-father
kalap, kalup	καλαπόδι	shoe tree
kamato	κάματος	labour, toil, debt

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

kamatnik	τοκογλύφος	usurer
kamila	καμήλα	camel
kamilar	καμηλάρης	camel-driver
kanestra	κάνιστρο	basket
kapelija	κάπελας	tavern-keeper
kaps	κάψη, θέρμη	warmth, heat
kapsima, kaptsima	κάψιμο	burn
karfija	καρφὶ	nail
karfitsa	καρφίτσα	pin
katandija	κατάντια	poor condition, degeneration
katara	κατάρα	curse
katizma	κάθισμα	stool, seat
kefalija	κεφαλὴ	head
keramida, kiramida, geramida, gramida	κεραμίδα	tile
kerata	κερατὰς	cuckold, rogue
kivur	κιβούρι	coffin, tomb
kimion	κίμινο	cumin
kiparis	κυπαρίσσι	cypress
kir	κὺρ	sir
kirie	κύριος	gentleman
kira	κυρά, κυρία	lady, mistress
klistir	κλειστήρι, (κλύσμα)	enema
klisoura	κλεισούρα	a narrow pass
klon	κλῶνος	branch
klonka	κλωναράκι	little branch
kokal	κόκκαλο	bone
komat	κομμάτι	a part
kopan	κόπανος	knocker
korab, kurab	καράβι	vessel, ship
korem	κορμὸς	body, trunk of a tree
kofnid	κοφινίδι	basket
kromid, kromit	κρομμύδι	onion
kumbija	κουμπὶ	button
kutija	κουτὶ	box
kutel	κούτελο	forehead
kutsoulja	κουτσουλιὰ	bird's dung
lad	λάδι	oil
ladka	λαδικὸ	oiling-can

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

lakan	λεκάνη	basin, brazier
lamja, lamnia	λάμια	lamnia, ogress
lastar	βλαστάρι	sprig
lahana, laana	λάχανα	cabbage
leonka, leunka	λεχώνα	woman in child-bed
lera	λέρα	dirt
liva	λίβας	south-west wind
livada	λειβάδι	meadow
lizgar	λισγάρι	mattock
lisida	ἁλυσσίδα	chain
lit	ἠλίθιος	imbecile
mavrada	μαυράδα	blackness (a disease of the vine)
mavrud	μαῦρο σταφύλι	black grape
magare	γομάρι, γάιδαρος	a load, an ass
magnit	μαγνήτης	magnet
malamo	μάλαμα	gold
mandal	μάνδαλος	latch, bolt
mandra	μάνδρα	hedge, sheep-pen
margar, margarit	μαργαρίτης	pearl
migdal, mindal	μύγδαλο	almond
mirodija, merudija	μυρωδιὰ	smell, perfume
mistrjia	μυστρὶ	trowel
monokero	μονόκερως	unicorn
mramor	μάρμαρο	marble
musikija, muzikija	μουσικὴ	music
murenka	μουριὰ	mulberry tree
mustak	μουστάκι	moustache
muhla	μοῦχλα	mildew
niruja	νερὸ	water, fountain, brook
nifa	νύφη	bride
noima	νόημα	sense, wit, sign
oktar, uhtar	ὀχτάρι	eightsome (a weight)
omjas, omjaz	ὁμοιότης	resemblance
opistje	πιστιὰ (ὀπίσω)	saddle strap
ora kali	ὥρα καλὴ	farewell
organ	ὄργανο	musical instrument
oriz, oris	ρύζι	rice
orismitsa	ὁρισμένο	fate

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

orfana	ὀρφανὰ	orphans
ohtika, oftika	ἐκτική, χτικιὸ	sickness, consumption
pagida, paida	παγίδα	trap
pagur	παγούρι	water-bottle
palivot	παληόβοδο	old ox
palikaro	παληκάρι	young man
panagon, panag, panak	πανωγόμι	overload
paplama	πάπλωμα	quilt
papule	παπούλης	old man
parakav	παρακάμι, νυχτέρι	night-work
paramana	παραμάννα	nurse
paranom	παρανόμι	nickname
paraspur	παρασπόρι	a field granted by a landlord to a serf
paratir, parafir	παραθύρι	window
parjasnitsa	παρατημένη (γυναίκα) (from the verb παριάζω= abandon)	abandoned, divorced woman
paspal	πάσπαλη	fine flour
patrida	πατρίδα	fatherland
peza	παίξιμο) (from the verb παίζω= play)	play, game, joke
peziol	πεζοβόλος	a kind of net
pendara	πεντάρα	five-penny coin
pepun	πεπόνι	melon
petal	πέταλο	horse-shoe
peher	πεθερὸς	father-in-law
pizma	πεῖσμα	spite
pinakida, panakida	πινακίδα	placard
pinakota	πινακωτὴ	board for carrying bread from the oven
piper	πιπεριὰ	pepper
piperka	πιπεριὰ	pepper-tree
pira	πυρὰ	pyre, fire, heat
pirg	πύργος	tower
piret	ὑπηρέτης	servant
piron	πειρούνι	fork
pirostija, pirustija	πυροστιὰ	gridiron
pisa	πίσσα	tar

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

pihtija	πηχτὴ	jelly, pie
plit	πλίθος	brick
plita	πλιθάρι	brick
potir	ποτήρι	glass, mug
pramatar	πραματευτὴς	salesman
pramatija	πραμάτεια	merchandise
pras, praz	πράσσο	leek
prika, prikia, prekija, pirkija	προῖκα, προικιὰ	dowry
prion	πριόνι	saw
progima, proima,	πρόγευμα	breakfast
prokopija	προκοπὴ	progress,improvement
proksinit, prosinit	προξενητὴς	match-maker
proksinitka	προξενήτρα	woman match-maker
proskefal	προσκέφαλο	pillow
raftaka	ραφτικὰ	tailor's fee
rema	ρέμα	stream, a cold
rovit, rofit, ririf	ρεβύθι	chickpea
sasma	σάγισμα	harnessing
sakuljka	σακουλάκι	small bag
samar	σαμάρι	saddle
samolad	(ση)σαμόλαδο	sesam oil
saratse	σαράκι	wood-worm, sickness
safa	σκάφη	tub
svingar	σφουγγάρι	sponge
sidero	σίδερο	iron
sinap	σινάπι	mustard-seed
sinor	σύνορο	frontier
skara	σκάρα	grill
skepar	σκεπάρνι	hammer
skilida	σκελίδα	stick of garlic
sklavje	σκλαβιὰ	slavery, servitude
skopos	σκοπὸς	sentinel, sentry
skumrija	σκουμπρὶ	mackerel
sokarditska	ἐσωκάρδι (γιλέκο)	vest
spila	σπηλιὰ	cave
splina	σπλήνα	spleen
spolaiti, spolat, spolai	'ς πολλὰ ἔτη, σπολλάτη	many years (an expression of thanks)
stafida	σταφίδα	black current

stihija, stija	στοιχειὸ	ghost
stipsa, stiptsa	στύφη	alum
stomah	στομάχι	stomach
stomna, stovna	στάμνα	pitcher
strak	ὄστρακο	shell
sulundar	σωληνάριο	(test)-tube, vial
susam	σησάμι	sesam
shedio	σχέδιο	sketch, drawing
taistro	τάγιστρο	feeding tub
tajane, tajani	τ' ἅη Γιάννη	Saint John's (feast)
taksidar	ταξειδιάρης	wanderer, traveller
taksit	ταξείδι	travel, journey
talant	τάλαντο	talent
taros	θάρρος	courage
temel	θεμέλιο	foundation
tef	θειάφι	sulphur
tigan, tigani	τηγάνι	pan
tiganitza	τηγανίτα	doughnuts
times	θύμηση	remembrance
tipkanie	χτύπημα (from the verb τύπτω=hit)	blow
tiran	τύραννος	tyrant
tiranija	τυραννία	tyranny
tif	τῦφος	typhus
trap	τράφος, τάφρος	ditch, trench, low wall
trevlivenie	τραύλισμα	stammering
trem	τέρεμνον, ἀστρέγα	eave
trandafil, triandafil, trendafil, trindafil, trondafil	τριαντάφυλλο	rose
trigos	τρύγος	vintage
trufenie	τρυφὴ	comfort, luxury
tšereša, tšerešna, tšreša, treša	κεράσι	cherry
tsrkva	Κυριακὴ	Sunday, church
tsveklo	σέσκουλο	beet
ulera	χολέρα	cholera
uma	χῶμα	soil
urou	ὄροβος, ρόβι	vetch
falaka, valaka, valaga	φάλαγγας	stooks, ferule
farmak	φαρμάκι	poison

ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

fasul	φασούλι	bean
fijala	φιάλη, πλόσκα	bottle, flask
fikija	βικίον, φλυτζάνι	cup
firida	θυρίδα	small window
fortoma, hortoma, ortoma	φόρτωμα	load
ftas	φτασμένη (ὥρα)	right time
ftis, stis	φθίσις	consumption
fuska	φούσκα	bubble
hara	χαρὰ	joy
harak	χαράκι	ruler
harkoma	χάρκωμα	brass
harta	χαρτιὰ (τράπουλας)	playing cards
hartija	χαρτὶ	paper
hiljada, iljada	χιλιάδα	a thousand
horjatin	χωριάτης	peasant, rustic
horo, oro	χορὸς	dance
hrisje	χρήση	use
hunija, unija, funija	χωνὶ	funnel

B. Adjectives

avtonom	αὐτόνομος	autonomous
anapodo	ἀνάποδος	reversed, on the wrong side
anustu	ἄνοστος	insipid
aplos	ἁπλὸς	plain, simple
afrat	ἀφράτος	frothy, fluffy
babakeren	βαμβακερὸς	of cotton
bez-rizitsen	ὁ χωρὶς ριζικὸ	unfortunate
eftin	φτηνὸς	cheap
kerdosnik	κερδισμένος	winner
kuf, kuh	κούφιος	hollow, empty
levter	λεύτερος	unmarried, free
liksur	λείξουρος	gourmand
malamen	μαλαματένιος	of gold
ne-praksan	ἄπραγος	inexperienced
ne-skoposen	ἄσκοπος	aimless
oftik-liv	φθισικὸς	consumptive
pitimen, pitimija	ἐπιθυμητὸς	wished, desirable
praksan	μὲ πράξη, (ἔμπειρος)	experienced

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

prokopsan	προκομμένος	diligent
spanio	σπάνιος	rare
stir, stira	στεῖρος -στεῖρα	barren, sterile
ftesen	φταίχτης	guilty
harin, aren, harno	χαρούμενος	full of joy, gay
hondrokefal	χοντροκέφαλος	stupid

C. Verbs

upikasam zapikasam apikasam pikasam opikasam	ἀπεικάζω	to understand
argasuvam argasam	ἀργάζω, δουλεύω	to work
po-argisam argisam	ἀργῶ	to be out of work, to stop
resam arisam aresam	ἀρέσω	to be liked, to please
armatosam se	ἁρματώνομαι	to arm oneself
armasam	ἁρμόζω	to fit, to connect
arnisam	ἀρνοῦμαι	to refuse
arpazuvam	ἁρπάζω	to seize
vapsuvam	βάφω	to dye
varjusam	βαρειέμαι	to be bored
vjasam	βιάζω	to force
vtasam	φτάνω	to arrive
vtesam	φταίω	to do wrong, to offend
gavram se	γαυριῶ	to joke
deksam	δέχομαι	to admit, to agree
dikisuvam	δικαιώνω	to justify
dipljam	διπλώνω	to fold
dukimasam	δοκιμάζω	to taste, to try
eksigisam	ἐξηγῶ	to explain
ela	ἔλα	come (imperative sing.)
elate	ἐλᾶτε	come (imperative plural)
zalisuvam, zalisam	ζαλίζω	to make giddy
zgiavoluvam	διαβουλεύομαι	to deliberate
zigosuvam	ζυγίζω	to weigh
zilepsuvam, zilosam	ζηλεύω	to envy
zuvgradisam zografisam	ζωγραφίζω	to draw, to paint

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

ikisitaksam	ἐξετάζω	to examine
isihisam isihasam	ἡσυχάζω	to rest
kalamisuvam	καλαμίζω	to spin
akalesam kalesam	καλῶ	to invite
nat-kalesam		
katigorisam	κατηγορῶ	to accuse
kenosam	κενώνω	to empty
kerdosam	κερδίζω	to win, to succeed
kinisuvam kinisam	κινῶ, ξεκινῶ	to move, to start
klotsam	κλωτσῶ	to kick
laha-se	λαχαίνει	it happens
latipsa	λάθεψα	I was wrong
lipsuvam lipsam	λείπω, ἐλλείπω	to be absent, to be insufficient
magepsuvam	μαγεύω	to bewitch
malamosam	μαλαματώνω	to gild
martirisam	μαρτυρῶ	to testify
merisam mirisam	μυρζίω	to smell
molepsam	μολεύω	to infect, to molest
muhlosam	μουχλιάζω	to get mildewed
navjaksuvam	ἀνεβάζω, ἀπανωβάζω	to raise, to complete
navaksuvam		
namnisuvam	ἀναμιμνήσκω	to remind
napilesam	ἀπειλῶ	to threaten
omaleksuvam	ἐξομαλύνω, μαλάσσω	to soften, to knead
umjasam	ὁμοιάζω	to resemble
mjasam omjasam		
mnesam		
oriste	ὁρίστε	welcome, please
orse	ὅρσε	
papsam	παύω	to stop, to cease
parakamnuvam	παρακάμνω	to (over)work, overdo
param	παίρνω	to take
paraftasam	παραφθάνω	to reach, to suffice
parjasam	παρατάω	to abandon
pataksam	πατάσσω	to subdue, to calm, to bring peace
patam	παθαίνω	to suffer
pedepsam	παιδεύω	to train, to inflict suffering on a person

ΚΕΝΤΡΟ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

pezam	παίζω	to play
pizmam	πεισμώνω	to spite
plakosam	πλακώνω	to press, to weigh upon
plasam	πλάθω	to knead
praksam	πράττω	to do, to learn
prepsam	πρέπω	to become
prikosam	προικίζω	to give a dowry, to endow
prokopsam	προκόβω	to progress, to improve
psovisam, ptsoisam	ψοφῶ	to die
skiasam	σκιάζω	to frighten
s-kitaksam	κυττάζω	to see
skopsam	σκώπτω	to mock
s-lisam se	λύνομαι	I untie myself
s-mramoruvam	μαρμαρώνω	to turn into stone
sosam	σώζω	to save
stivasam stivasuvam	στοιβάζω	to pile
streksam	στρέγω	to agree, to admit
taksam, f-taksam	τάζω	to promise, to pledge
tentosuvam	τεντώνω	to stretch
timisuvam	τιμῶ	to honour
tipkam	τύπτω, χτυπῶ	to hit
tiposam	τυπώνω	to print
tihisa	ἔτυχε	it happened
trevlivam	τραυλίζω	to stammer
trigisam	τρυγῶ	to gather grapes
trufam se	τρυφῶ	to adorn (oneself)
stasam ftasam	φτάνω	to arrive
ftesam vtesam	φταίω	to be guilty
ftisam	χτίζω	to build
arizam, arižam harizam	χαρίζω	to make a gift
arosam harosam	πετυχαίνω (from the noun χαρὰ)	to succeed
horatuvam	χωρατεύω	to joke

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ · ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ·

D. Other parts of speech.

Adverbs: Agale (ἀγάλι)=slowly, nefela (ἀνώφελα)=uselessly, tora (τώρα) = now, makar (μακάρι)=at least, even, though, so be it.

Pronouns: Kata (κάθε)=each, as the first part of compound Slavic words as in kataden=each day, kata-vetser=each night, kata-utro= each morning, kata-godina=each year. Mu(μου) =mine, my, maiko mu =mother mine!

Prepositions: Anti (ἀντὶ) as the first part of compound Slavic words as in antifasist, para (παρα) as first part of compound Slavic words as in para-majka (παραμάννα)=step-mother, parasestra (παρα-δελφὴ)= half sister, para-gledam (παραβλέπω) = to overlook.

Conjunctions: Ami (ἂν μὴ) =unless.

Particles: Mi (μὴ) not.

Exclamations: More (μωρὲ) old chap! Mori (μωρὴ) old girl!, bre (βρὲ) or and re, kakochrononachi (κακὸ χρόνο νά 'χη) = to hell with him, pa pa (πω, πω)!

Words with Northern Greek phonetic form

It is significant that many Greek words of the Slavic dialect of Skopje, are characterized by the northern Greek phonetic type as the change of unaccented *O* into *U* and of the unaccented *e* in *i* as also —less frequently— the rejection of the unaccented *I.*

1. The change of the unaccented *o* into *u.*

Anustu, enurija, flurin, zugraf, kaluger, kukona, mirudija, pirustija, ulera, uhtar, dukimasam, zugrafisam, skulasam, umjasam. The verbal ending —suvam (vapsuvam, zilepsuvam, kinisuvam, mitosuvam, timisuvam etc.) from the northern-Greek ending of the future tense— *sou* instead of *-so.*

2. The change of the unaccented *e* into *i.*

Ilinika, kiramida, latipsa, milan, pro (g) ima, proksinit, ririf, sindilija, skilida, tsirimonia, ikisitaksam.

3. Rejection of the unaccented *I* - Kofnid.

2. Words from the language of the Church and Education.

A. Nouns

agiazmo	ἁγιασμὸς	sanctification
agripnija, igripnie	ἀγρυπνία	wakefulness
ambon	ἄμβων	pulpit
anafora	ἀναφορὰ	reference

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

angel	ἄγγελος	angel
apokalipsis	ἀποκάλυψις	apokalypse
apopleksija	ἀποπληξία	apoplexy
apostol	ἀπόστολος	apostle
aro	χάρος	charon, death
arhangel	ἀρχάγγελος	archangel
arhierej	ἀρχιερεὺς	bishop
asketija	ἀσκητὴς	hermit
aforismo	ἀφορισμὸς	aphorism, excommunication
gramatik	γραμματικὸς	clerk
giak	διάκος	deacon
didaskal, daskal	διδάσκαλος	teacher
daskalits	διδασκάλισσα	woman teacher
dijakonija	διακονία	mendicity, diocese
dijarija	διάρροια	diarrhea
dijeta	δίαιτα	diet
diplomatika	διπλωματία	diplomacy
djavol, giavol	διάβολος	devil
evangelije, vangelije	εὐαγγέλιο	gospel
evangelist	εὐαγγελιστὴς	evangelist
egumen, igumen	ἡγούμενος	a prior
eksarhos	ἔξαρχος	exarch
enurija	ἐνορία	parish
epilepsija	ἐπιληψία	epilepsy
epitimion	ἐπιτίμιον	penance
pitrop epitrop	ἐπίτροπος	guardian, trustee
epopeja	ἐποποιΐα	epic, poetry
eres	αἵρεση	heresy
efimerija	ἐφημέριος	parish priest
efharistija	εὐχαριστία	thanksgiving
igemon	ἡγεμὼν	king, prince
idol	εἴδωλον	idol
ikona	εἰκόνα	ikon
ikonostas, ikonastas	εἰκονοστάσι	place to put the ikons, shrine
ikonom	οἰκονόμος	economic
ikonomija	οἰκονομία	economy
ipostas	ὑπόσταση	existence
ipsoma	ὕψωμα	height

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

istorija	ἱστορία	history
kalamar	καλαμάρι	inkstand
kalimavka	καλημαῦχι	a priest's head-cove ing
kaluger, kauger	καλόγερος	monk
kalugerka	καλογρηὰ	nun
kandilonaft	κανδηλανάφτης	a sexton
kanon	κανὼν	the rule, canon
klisar	ἐκκλησάρης	sacristan
kolas	κόλασις	hell
kolivo	κόλυβο	a sweet meat offere in memory of the dea
kontil (e)	κοντῆλι	pencil
lambada	λαμπάδα	large candle, torch
lipsana, liptsana	λείψανα	corpse
litija	λειτανία	litany
liturgija	λειτουργία	liturgy, mass
mager	μάγειρας	cook (of a monastery
magernitsa	μαγειριὸ	kitchen (of a mona- stery)
magija	μαγεία	spell, charm
magesnik, magenitsa	μάγος, μάγισσα	wizard, witch
maesna		
martir	μάρτυρας	martyr
matima	μάθημα	lesson
melan, milan	μελάνι	ink
metanija	μετάνοια	repentance
metoh, metuh	μετόχι	land that belongs to a monastery
mirizma, merizma	μύρισμα	odour
miro	μῦρο	myrrh
mirosuvanie	χρῖσμα μὲ μῦρο	chrism, anointment
mitropolija	μητρόπολις	metropolis
moliv	μολῦβι	pencil
monastir	μοναστῆρι	convent
monoklisija	μονοκκλησιὰ	a mass in one church only
natema	ἀνάθεμα	anathema
nafora	ἀναφορὰ	report
nimosino	μνημόσυνο	requiem

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

ovtok	ὀκτοῆχι	octet
Panagi(j)a	Παναγία	the Holy Virgin
panagiur, pana(g)ir	πανηγῦρι	feast
paradiz	παράδεισος	paradise
paraklis	παρεκκλῆσι	small church, chapel
parastas	παράσταση	requiem, service
pater	πάτερ (καλόγερος)	monk
pateritsa	πατερίτσα	crutch, stick
petravil, petra(h)il	πετραχῆλι	stole
plaka	πλάκα	slab, slate
poli(e)lej	πολυέλαιος	chandelier
politika	πολιτικὴ	politics
pop	παπᾶς	priest
popadija, popagija	παπαδιὰ	a priest's wife
prezviter, prezvitera	πρεσβύτερος, -έρα	priest, priest's wife abbess
prosvora, proskura, poskura	προσφορὰ	offer for consecration
protoger	πρωτόγερος	an elder
protosingel	πρωτοσύγγελος	chief overseer (in the Greek church)
protudrak	πρωτοδράκος	chief dragon, chief devil
profet	προφήτης	prophet
psalom	ψαλμωδία	psalm, church singing
psalt	ψάλτης	singer, chanter
psaltir	ψαλτῆρι	psalm book
psaltikija	ψαλτικὴ	the art of chanting
ravon, raun	ἀρραβὼν	engagement
savan, vasan	σάβανο	shroud
sarandar	σαραντάρι	40 days' requiem service
sindilija	συντέλεια	end of the world, catastrophe
skolija, tškolija, škola školija	σχολεῖο	school
stihira	στιχηρὰ	church songs
stratik	στρατιώτης	soldier, military
tartar	τάρταρα	hell

ΕΤΑΙΡΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

tetradka, tetratka	τετράδιο	copy-book
timen, temjan	θυμίαμα	incense
trapeza, trpenza	τράπεζα	altar
trimer, trimir	τριήμερο	three days' fast
tron, troni	θρόνος, θρονὶ	throne
tropar	τροπάριο	hymn
filosof, vilosof	φιλόσοφος	philosopher
filosofija	φιλοσοφία	philosophy
fotografija	φωτογραφία	photography

B. Adjectives

eretik	αἱρετικὸς	heretic
katarosan	καταραμένος	cursed
hrisjanin	χριστιανὸς	christian

C. Verbs

aneste	ἀνέστη	resurrected
Ristos aneste!	Χριστὸς ἀνέστη!	Christ is resurrected
aforesam	ἀφορίζω	excommunicate
liturgisam	λειτουργῶ	to celebrate Mass
metanisam	βάζω μετάνοια	to prostrate oneself
mirosuvam	μυρώνω	to anoint
natemisam	ἀναθεματίζω	to anathematise
proskinisam	προσκυνῶ	to bow
psalam	ψάλλω	to sing
skulasam	σχολνῶ	to dismiss (class)
trimeram	νηστεύω τριήμερο	to fast for three day

D. Proper Nouns

Aleks, Aleksandar, Andreja, Argir, Atanas, Dimitar, Eftim, George Gligorie, Hristo, Kiril, Petar, Spiro, Todore, Trendafil, Vasil, Zoe etc. etc.

Greek words which passed into the dialect from foreign languages

Many Greek words appear in the dialect of the State of Skopje in alien form —which shows that the loan of such words was not effected directly from Greek but from other languages. Those words they borrowed earlier and assimilated according to their own grammatical rules. To this category belong scientific terms of the ancient Greek

language which scholars, not the people, borrowed from the languages of Western Europe. Therefore they bear no relation to the question of neighbourly contacts or the influence by the Greeks on the Slavs. I will therefore limit myself to giving a few examples of words of Greek extraction which the people themselves borrowed from foreign languages— from Turkish.

anason	ἄνισον	anise
afion	ἀφιόνι	opium
efendija	αὐθέντης	boss
giubre	κοπρηὰ	dung
kalem	κάλαμος	cane
krevet	κρεβάτι	bed
kesten	κάστανο	chestnut
legen	λεκάνη	basin
liman	λιμάνι	port
magdanos	μακεδονὴ	parsley
mastiha	μαστίχα	chewing-gum
mermer	μάρμαρο	marble
palavra	παραβολὴ	comparison
palamud	παλαμύδα	sort of fish
peksimet	παξιμάδι	toast
pita (Ital. pitta Lat. picta)	πίττα	cake, pie
porjaz	βορρηᾶς	north wind
somum	ψωμὶ	bread
srma	σῦρμα	wire
sunger	σφουγγάρι	sponge
talaz	θάλασσα	sea
tefter	διφθέρα	a dressed hide
tolosom	τελισίμη	amulet
fener	φανάρι	lantern
filiz	φυλλίς, φυλλὰς	dish of cabbage
fidan	φιντάνι, φυτὸν	plant
sinik	χοῖνιξ	a measure

and so on.

Foreign words which passed into the Skopje dialect from Greek

Unlike the previous case, there is in the Skopje dialect a significant number of foreign words which came to it through Greek. It is clear

that such words were borrowed not direct from the language of their origin, but from Greek. Such words are the following:

Of Popular Origin

Avgust	Αὔγουστος (Lat. Augustus)	August
bubak	βαμβάκι (Pers. pambak)	cotton
vigla	βίγλα (Lat. vigilia)	outpost, sentry
kamara	κάμαρα (Lat. camera)	room
kambana	καμπάνα (Ital. campana)	bell
kantar	καντάρι (Lat. centenarium)	a hundredweight
kapa	κάππα (Lat. cappa)	cape
kapistra	καπίστρι (Lat. capistrum)	bridle
katinar	κατηνάρι (Lat. catena)	chain
kelar	κελλάρι (Lat. cellarium)	cellar
kelija	κελλὶ (Lat. cella)	cell
krevet	κρεβάτι (Lat. grabbatus)	bed
kukla	κοῦκλα (Ital. cocolo)	doll
kukona	κοκκώνα (Rum. cocoana)	lady, madam
lamba	λάμπα (Ital. lampa)	lamp
litra	λίτρα (Ital. litra)	pound (weight)
lira	λίρα (Ital. lira)	pound
lukanik	λουκάνικο (Lat. lukanicum)	sausage
magija	μαγεία (Iran. mag)	spell
majstor	μάστορας (Lat. magister)	master-workman
mantija	μαντὶ (Lat. mantum)	shawl
marula	μαρούλι (Lat. amarula)	lettuce
mesala	μεσάλι (Lat. mensala)	table-cloth
mutra	μοῦτρα (Ital. mutria)	face
nunko, nunka	νουννός, νουννὰ (Ital. nonnus)	god-father and god-mother
palata	παλάτι (Lat. palatium)	palace
panukla	πανοῦκλα (Lat. panucula)	plague
patata	πατάτα (Span. patata)	potatoe
pogan	παγανὸς (Lat. paganus)	pagan
porta	πόρτα (Lat. porta)	door
portokal	πορτοκάλι (Ital. portogallo)	orange
rizik	ριζικὸ (Ital. risiko)	fate
sapun	σαπούνι (Celtolat. sapo)	soap
skala	σκάλα (Lat. scala)	ladder
skamnija	σκαμνὶ (Lat. scamnum)	stool

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

skufija	σκούφια (Ital. scuffia)	bonnet
spanak	σπανάκι (Lat. spinaceum)	spinach
spitalje	σπιτάλι (Lat. hospitale)	hospital
sterna	στέρνα (Lat. cisterna)	pond
šufra	σούφρα (Lat. sup(p)ula)	crease, fold
ungija	οὐγγιὰ (lat. uncia)	ounce
felija	φελλὶ (Lat. offela)	slice
flurin, florin	φλουρὶ (Lat. florinus)	gold coin
furna	φοῦρνος (Lat. furnus)	oven
tsirimonija	τσιριμόνια (Ital. cerimonia)	ceremony

Of Scholastic Origin

vula	βοῦλα (Lat. bulla)	seal
kandilo	καντῆλι (Lat. candela)	lamp
codix	κῶδιξ (Lat. codex)	code
pangar	παγκάρι (Ital. banca)	money-chest of a church
paradis	παράδεισος (Iran. pairidaesa)	paradise
Pasha	Πάσχα (Hebr. pesah)	Easter

Influence of Grammar

Greek influence without any doubt accounts for, 1) the obsolescence of the infinitive which Serv retains. 2) the periphrastic form of the present perfect, e.g. *imam videno* —I have (it) seen, and perhaps 3) the periphrastic form of the future, e.g. *imam da* —I have to...

Historical conclusions from the impact of Greek on the Slavic Language.

The considerable number of words which came into Balkan Slavic from Greek, through direct ethnological contact, a narrow sample of which has been given above, is of major interest to the student of the national origins of our northern neighbours. For in addition to historical evidence in regard to the Slavic expansion in Greek territories, the Greek linguistic influence shows conclusively that when the Slavs began to invade the Balkan peninsula, they found it inhabited by a people who spoke only Greek, and not, as Slav historians maintain, Thracio-Illyrian. If the opposite were true, the Balkan Slav dialects would have been full not of Greek, but of Thracio-Illyrian words, which the Thracio-Illyrians, undergoing a gradual process of Slavisation, would have carried along, through the stage of bilingualism which is common

in such cases, to their new language. But where are those Thracio-Illyrian words? Quite simply, they do not exist.

Apart from the Latin language, the mother of contemporary Vlach which is spoken in some areas, and Albanian which is common in the north-western parts of the peninsula, the Slavs did not meet in the Balkans any other language but Greek. Thracio-Illyrian had disappeared a long time before their arrival, during the Hellenistic and the Roman eras. Only the Vissoi, a small Thracian tribe in the Rhodopi region, retained their Thracian language down to the 7th century A.D. It was hellenised however, before the Slavs could come into contact with it.

CHAPTER VII

IMPACT OF OTHER LANGUAGES ON THE DIALECT OF THE STATE OF SKOPJE

Next to Greek, the most powerful foreign influence on the dialect of the State of Skopje was Turkish. This is explained by the fact that throughout the period of Ottoman rule, Turkish was the official language in the Balkans for administrative purposes especially. The Turkish linguistic influence was stronger in the towns from where it extended to the villages and consists, primarily, in Turkish words taken up by the Slavophone population and in certain grammatical forms which influenced the Slavic vernacular.[12a]

Smaller but still considerable is the Albanian influence. That influence is explained by the fact that the Western part of the State of Skopje is inhabited by a compact Albanophone minority of 164.000 which Albania claims as her own. Where the two languages meet as in Kosovo and Metohija, Albano-Slavic bilingualism prevails. Ivan Popovič who recently made a study of this subject, quite arbitrarily considers the bilingual minority as Slavs who learnt Albanian and the Slavic elements of the Albanian dialect of the State of Skopje as the legacy of ancient Slavs who adopted the Albanian language.[12b] In fact the opposite is true, since, as is well known, the Albanians who are the direct descendants of the ancient Illyrians, lived in that region long before the Slavs and occupied a much larger geographical area.

12a See *G. Hazai*: Remarques sur les rapports des langues slaves des Balkans avec le turc-osmanli. Studia Slavica, Akad. Hung. 7 (1961) pp. 97 ff.

12b. See *Ivan Popovič*: Albanoslavica- Südostforschungen 15 (1956) p. 515.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

CHAPTER VIII

A HISTORY OF THE LINGUISTIC IDIOM OF THE STATE OF SKOPJE

There can be little doubt that the mediaeval form of the dialect of the State of Skopje was closely related to that into which the Thessalonian Greek missionaries Cyrill and Methodius translated parts of the Bible during the 9th century A.D. This view is both logically correct and historically proven, while there is not a shred of evidence in support of the theory put forward by some Slav linguists, that the language of that translation is a Slavic dialect spoken in the city of Thessaloniki. For it is more than certain that, during the Byzantine era, the capital of Greek Macedonia remained purely Greek. Its success in repelling invaders ensured that up to that time it was never inhabited either by Slavs, or even by Slavophone elements which might have developed a dialect. But who could ever prevail on the dreamers of Slav expansion to the Aegean Sea to abandon this cherished fallacy? To the north of Thessaloniki there surely were during the 9th century Slav agricultural settlements whose dialect Cyril and Methodius may well have used. It is plausible to argue that this was related to the dialect of northern Macedonia closely enough to be regarded as the precursor of the modern dialect of the State of Skopje.

The disciples of Cyril and Methodius, Klenes of Ochris, Nahum and their other Slav successors, continued the work of their masters, with the result that the hitherto obscure, unpolished and undeveloped dialect of Macedonian Slavs, gradually rose to the eminence of a cultured ecclesiastical language, formed and enriched on the model of the Greek. This later spread to the whole of the Slavic world as the language of the Church and, subsequently, as the literary, written language of the Slavs, before the emergence of local Slavic vernaculars.

Some eighty manuscripts containing Slav ecclesiastical texts of the 12th to the 14th century survive to this day. They are written in that language which is now regarded as the mother of the current Slavic dialects of Northern Macedonia, and therefore, of the new literary "language" cultivated in Skopje. Prominent among those manuscripts are the *Apostle of Ochris*, the *Gospel of Dobromir*, the *Gospel of Pope John* and the *Triod of Vitolji* which belong to the 12th century; the *Apostle*

of Vranešte, the *Hymn Book of Bologna* and the *Admonitions of Leskovo* which belong to the 13th century. The publication of those texts as important historical documents, is one of the principal tasks which the "Macedonian Language Institute" in Skopje has undertaken. It was for this purpose that the Stari Textovi Series (Ancient Texts) was founded.

When, during the 14th century, the whole of Macedonia was subjected by the Turks, the use and cultivation of the Macedonian form of the Slavonian language gradually became extinct. It was never revived for in 1557, Mehmet Sokolovič, a Grand Vizir of Slavic origin, consented to his brother's, the Serb patriarch Makarios', request and restored the Serb patriarchate of Peč with jurisdiction over the entire Slavophone part of northern Macedonia. Then, not only these Slavic manuscripts but also the texts which began to be printed in Venice and circulated in the Patriarchate's district throughout the 16th and 17th centuries were written in a Serb form of ecclesiastical Slavic, belonging to the so-called Resava School. Though some sporadic elements of Macedonian dialects are preserved, especially in popular literature, (e.g. Damaskenos) these works do not any longer belong to the historical texts of Macedonian Slavic.

When subsequently Russia became a major political power, and began to manifest interest in the Slavs of the Balkan peninsula, the wholesale importation of ecclesiastical books written in the Russian form of the Slavonic language, resulted in the Serb form of the written language being replaced by the Russian, which prevailed among northern Macedonian Slavs down to the end of the 19th century.

The Slavo-Greek glossary to which reference has been made above (p. 17) is of major interest for the history of this dialect. Written by a Greek of Macedonia, in Greek characters, it contained 301 Slav words and phrases that were current in the region of Kastoria. It was first published from a Vatican Code by C. Giannelli and A. Vaillant under the title «Un Lexique Macédonien du XVIe Siècle» in the series of the «Institut d' Etudes Slaves de l' Université de Paris» (1958). This glossary has made it possible to estimate the dates of the different grammatical features of Slavic dialects, on which the so-called «Macedonian language» is based.

From the 17th century onwards the living local idiom breaks through the ice of Serb and later Russian Slavonian, making at first a modest appearance in a few insignificant texts. Such were the *Epistle* of *Krusevo* and some texts written in Greek characters of which the quadrilingual Greek, Albanian, Aromounian and Slav dictionary

by Daniel Moschopolite (1793) was an example. The Slav language is represented by the Slavic dialect of Ochrid (there was no official Serb or Bulgarian language yet). Of interest is also the translation of the Gospel that was published in Salonica in 1852. These texts, however, later offended Bulgarian nationalism. Ever since the Bulgarian exarchate took the place of the Ecumenical patriarchate in the Slavophone parts of Macedonia, late in the 19th century, it has indeed refused to tolerate any form of Slavic literature, other than Bulgarian.

Quite clearly then, important written documents of the Slavic Macedonian dialects appear only between the 9th and 13th centuries. On these the linguists and philologists of Skopje have tried to base their contentions that the dialect for which they claim the status of a separate and independent language, has an ancient written tradition. They forget that such a tradition is not sufficient to transform an idiom or dialect into a separate language. Several other idioms and dialects have written traditions without, for that reason, being regarded as distinct languages. Such for instance are the ancient Greek dialects which possess written documents, but do not, as a result of this, constitute separate languages. Cyprus can equally claim its written documents which belong to the Middle Ages, but no one has ever propounded the theory of a Cypriot modern Greek dialect, let alone the existence of a distinct hellenic language in Cyprus. And the same could be said of Italian and French mediaeval dialects, to mention only a few well-known examples.

CHAPTER IX

CONTEMPORARY LITERARY MOVEMENTS IN THE SKOPJE DIALECT

So far we have studied the Slavic character of the dialect spoken by the inhabitants of the State of Skopje, its differences from ancient Slavic, its relations with the modern Bulgarian and Serb languages, we discussed its few peculiarities, the impact of spoken Greek on it and finally its written documents. Until recently, the dialect of the State of Skopje showed no uniformity. Several forms of it were spoken in different parts of the country. A common form either written or spoken was unknown and there was practically no literature. The only language which could be regarded common to the entire region was the relatively more developed Bulgarian, a

fact which placed the Slavophone Northern Macedonia in a position of cultural dependence on Bulgaria. As early as 1858 Partenij Zografski had proposed a compromise, namely a fusion of Bulgarian and «Macedonian» linguistic elements, since the established Bulgarian language which is based primarily on eastern Bulgarian idioms, sounds somewhat alien to the Serbs of the Skopje region. This solution was supported by the Serbs, but objected to by the Bulgarians who considered it «Bulgaro-Serb». After, however, this territory was annexed by Serbia in 1912 and to a still higher degree after it was first proclaimed an autonomous state in 1944 and added to the group of six confederate states which constitute Yugoslavia, the chief and foremost concern both of the central Yugoslav Government and of the Skopje authorities, was to free the people of that region from their intellectual and linguistic dependence on Bulgaria. To this end it was necessary: 1) to weaken and make less conspicuous the close relationship of the idiom with Bulgarian and to stress, to place under a stronger light, its lesser affinity with Serb; 2) to give the idiom official status immediately and cultivate it as a written language under the influence of Serb, for administrative, literary and scientific purposes. It was hoped in this way to widen the gap between that idiom and Bulgarian and to bring it closer to Serb.

It was with this end in view that a few months after the creation of the State of Skopje, in September 1944, the National Assembly set up a committee of scholars, writers and scientists to determine the grammatical form and spelling of this new Slavic «language», which thus took its place, for the first time, amongst the known Slavic languages. This committee carried out the mandate of the National Assembly in the following manner: 1) As a grammatical basis for the new language, it used not the western form spoken between the Lakes of Ochris and Prespa as originally considered, but the form spoken in the most densely populated central area of the State, namely in the region west of the river Axios (Vardar) which is contained in the quadrangle Prilep-Bitolja-Kičevo-Veles and forms the borderland where the extreme forms of the idiom meet. 2) In order to enrich the vocabulary, the Committee adopted the principle of cleansing the language from Turkish admixtures and of borrowing words, where necessary, from other Yugoslav dialects or forming new words for modern concepts, thus limiting recourse to foreign languages to cases of absolute necessity. The complete lack of scientific terms places the scholars and scientists before a difficult dilemma. Should they import from other

Slavic or European languages, or should they create new words of their own? They cannot afford to waste time for they must answer the pressing claims of science, education, the Press, administration, and broadcasting. 3) The problem of spelling was solved by establishing phonetic spelling, i.e., writing each sound exactly as it is pronounced, disregarding historical spelling completely. The silent big *R* and small *r*, which Bulgarian retained until recently, were abolished, the soft (palatial) consonants were represented in the Serbian manner where Serb has similar consonants, i.e., soft *l* was represented by *b* and soft *n* by *H* or, where Serb has no equivalent sounds, a symbol of stress served to denote soft consonants, as *K'* (=soft *K*), *Γ'* (=soft *g*).

The committee's recommendations were implemented by a law of the 3rd May 1945 which came into force on the 7th June of the same year. This law established this new language as the only official and acceptable medium for any form of intellectual activity in the new State. The Philosophical Faculty of the university of Skopje became, naturally, the centre of study, cultivation and enrichment of this new language. Several school-grammar-books were produced, e.g. one by K. Kepeski and Bl. Kopeski. Since 1950 a special periodical entitled «Makedonski Jazik» (Macedonian language) and devoted to linguistic research and discussion of practical problems has been regularly published by the Philosophic Faculty under the direction of a board consisting of Bl. Koneski, Krum Tosev, Bozo Vidojeveski and Rada Ugrimova. In 1953 an «Institute of the Macedonian Language» was established. It was assigned the task of compiling and publishing an official dictionary. A committee composed of Bl. Koneski, M. Petrusevski and K. Tosev was established for that purpose. The first volume of this dictionary (A-N) appeared in Skopje in 1961 and the second (O-P) in 1965 under the title «Retšnik na Makedonskiot Jazik So Srpskohrvatski Tolkovania».[12c] The language of the new State of Skopje attracted the attention of foreign linguists. Thus the American H. Lunt, Professor of Slavonic studies at the University of Harvard, studied it extensively and published its grammar in English for the use of American students, under the title «Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language» (Skopje 1952).[13] The Italian linguist,

12c. See *K. Tosev.*: Prvata kniga na retsnikot na makedonskiot jazik in the Journal Makedonija No 107 (1962). Cf. *N. P. Andriotis* in the Journal Balkan Studies 2, (1962), pp. 201, ff.

13. *Cf. Bl. Koneski*: Makedonskata Literatura i Makedonskiot jazik (Skopje 1945), *Bl. Koneski*: Odzivenite recnicki elementi vo nasiot jazik, Nov. Dec. Vol. 3 (1945),

V. Pisani, published a very useful treatise «Il Macedonico» in the periodical «Paedeia» (12. 1957 pp. 249-264). Apart from linguistic studies and attempts to establish the grammatical structure of the language, its literary cultivation received within a few years an impulse so strong that it might be termed amazing. In addition to an affluent production of original literary works, scholars and philologists gave themselves to the systematic translation of the most important works of the world's literature - of Tolstoi, Gogol, Gorki, Shakespeare, Dickens, R. Rolland and Balzac - into the language of the State of Skopje. The reason for this truly impressive literary activity is obvious. It is the result of an effort to make up for lost time within the shortest possible period, to quicken the pace of progress and raise the region and its inhabitants to the level of intellectually developed nations. A parallel effort consists in making available plenty of reading material directly or indirectly conducive to Communist ideology. It is further attempted to accelerate the literary cultivation of the language and promote its enrichment with the means of expression which are naturally lacking in an idiom of rustics only just aspiring to the dignity of a cultured tongue. The fact that the literary cultivation idiom will permit it to increasingly deviate from the Bulgarian language and eventually break loose from Bulgarian domination is, of course, an added gain from the point of view of the political opportunism which determines the attitude of the leaders of the State of Skopje towards Bulgaria. This will also serve the ultimate objective, for when the educated classes of the people are able to satisfy their intellectual needs by books written in their mother tongue, they will no longer have to resort to Bulgarian writings; and this intellectual emancipation

---

Bl. Koneski, Nekoi beleski vo vrska so recnikot na nasiot jazik, Nov. Dec. No 7-8, *Krume Kepeski:* Makedonska Grammatica (Skopje 1950), *Bl. Koneski*, Grammatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik (Skopje 1952), *R. Aitzenmüller:* Südslawische Sprachwissenschaft 1945-1952, Südostforschungen 12 (1953), *Alois Schmaus:* Makedonische Schriftsprache und Literatur - Osteuropa 3 (1953) pp. 178-183, *Krum Tosev:* Die mazedonische Schriftsprache - Südostforschungen 15 (1956), pp. 491-503. *B. Ristovski:* Makedonskiot jazik vo zemiata i vo strantsvo - Makedonija 7 (1959, 70-71 *Bl. Koneski:* The Macedonian Literary Language (Beograd 1959). About the influence of the Greek language on the Slavs of the Balkans see: *A. G. Tahovski*: Grtski zborovi vo makedonskiot naroden govor (Filozofski Fakultet na Univerzitetot Skopje. Posebni Izdanija , kniga 1) (Skopje 1951). Cf. *G. Boukouvala*: Ἡ γλῶσσα τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ Βουλγαροφώνων (Cairo, 1905), *St. Mladenov*: Retžnik na tsuzdite dumi vaf bulgarskija ezik (Sofia 1932), *N. P. Andriotis*: Τὰ ἑλληνικὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς Βουλγαρικῆς γλώσσης. Thrac. Archives 17 (1945) pp. 65 ff.

will spell the end of the cultural and national orientation of the people of the State of Skopje towards Bulgaria.

The zeal with which this State has pursued its objectives through the media of public education is also impressive. The growth of education as compared with pre-war standards is unprecedented. In 1939-1940 there were, for the whole of the country, only 843 four-year Elementary Schools, 9 four-form Urban Schools, 6 complete High Schools, 1 Teacher's Training College and 4 Technical Colleges with a total of 109.118 students. During the scholastic year 1953 to 1954 these numbers had increased to 1.305 four-form Elementary Schools, 147 eight-form Elementary Schools, 12 four-form Secondary Schools, and 11 eight-form High Schools, 5 Senior Secondary Schools, 5 Teacher's Training Colleges, (medicine, economics, agriculture, veterinary services, music, art, physical education and engineering), 27 Lower Technical Schools, 21 Arts and Crafts Schools making up a total of 1.549 schools with a total number of 182.990 pupils. In the field of higher education during the pre-war years, there was only an incomplete philosophical school in Skopje with an average of 160 students. In 1946 a university was established for the first time. During the academic year 1953-1954, the university functioned with six faculties and a special school of post-graduate studies. The number of students by faculties is as follows:

Faculty of Philosophy	1.512
Faculty of Law and Economic Science	1.297
Faculty of Medicine	823
Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry	396
Technical School	483
Institute of Education	449

There were in other words, 4.960 students of which 3.704 were regular and 1.246 part-time auditors. By 1959 the number of students had reached the 7.955 mark.

The university staff consisted in 1958 of 300 university teachers: regular or part-time professors, lecturers, etc.

A further feature of the intensive work undertaken in the field of education, apart from increasing the number of public schools at all levels and establishing the University, is a major effort to reduce illiteracy. In the first post-war years 300.000 people could neither read nor write. At the end of 1953 their number had decreased to 235.347. By 1958, 31 libraries had been founded in towns, 300 in

villages, 377 in factories and 922 in schools. Another 47 libraries of special scientific interest brought the total number of books to a million and half. In 1939 there existed no more than 14 popular book shops and reading rooms, with 5.512 volumes all in all; by 1953 the number of such establishments had risen to 50, with 1.154.318 volumes.

In 1945, 3 museums existed in the country with 8.000 exhibits. In 1953 they had reached the number of 17. Finally the number of theatres has grown from 2 in 1939 (one in Skopje and one in Monastir) to to-day's 10, which in 1953 alone produced 270 tragedies, 95 operas, 5 operettas and 18 ballet shows.[13a] In 1958, 55 art exhibitions were organized which attracted 154.000 visitors. The Writers' Association which in 1954 had only 10 members, claimed 50 members in 1959. These merely indicative facts abundantly show with what zeal and enthusiasm the State of Skopje has pursued its linguistic, educational and cultural policies which, as we have seen, can be summed up as an effort to raise the very low cultural level of the people, to develop a national consciousness based on independence from other Slavic nations, more particularly Bulgaria, and to mould the Skopje dialect in such a way as to widen the gap between it and Bulgarian and to bring it closer to Serb.

As early as 1908 the great Slavic scholar, C. Jagič in his book «Die Slavischen Sprachen» (p. 21) described the early attempts to develop the Slavic dialect of that region into a written language as «a useless waste of intellectual energy». «The Macedonian language is really an artifice, produced for political purposes», wrote the Italian linguist Vittore Pisani in his treatise «Il Macedonico» in the periodical Paedeia (12, 1957, p. 250).

The justification which the country's cultural authorities put forward for the gradual transformation of the language under the influence of Serb is that by such means the understanding and cooperation between the people of the State of Skopje and those of the other republics of Yugoslavia will be enhanced.

As might be expected, the Bulgarians who, even under the communist regime, have not abandoned their strong nationalist feelings, have protested passionately against this Yugoslav policy which tends to alienate this region, linguistically and culturally, from Bulgaria.

13a. See Journal: Wissenschaftlicher Dienst für Südost-Europa 3 (1954) No. 11/12, cf. *L. Kolisevski*: Aspekti na makedonskoto prasanje (Skopje 1962), p. 324.

ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

They proclaim that the one common language of that area is Bulgarian and that the local forms are simply Bulgarian dialects. They further insist that a distinct Macedonian language does not exist and that the literary language which is now being developed as a common language for all Slavophones of Serb Macedonia is not Macedonian, but «Kolisefskian Serb» (after the name of the former premier of the State of Skopje, Lazar Kolisefski). They maintain that what is being done amounts to the wilful destruction of the language, that such action is perpetrated not by Macedonians, but rather by Serb agents, enemies of the people, instruments of the «Fascists of Belgrade» whose purpose has always been to undermine the national identity of the Macedonians of the Vardar and by «Serbianizing» the language to secure the assimilation of all Macedonians as they have already achieved the Serbianization of their surnames, changing the endings *-ef* and *-of* into *-efski* and *-ofski*.

In reply to the argument put forward by Dimitri Vlachof, that by gradually bringing closer the official language of the State of Skopje and the Serb language, the mutual understanding and co-operation of that people with the other federal states of Yugoslavia will be promoted, the Bulgarians say that the alteration of a language for the sake of temporary political objectives is unheard of and that this policy has been imposed by the rulers of Yugoslavia upon a reluctant Macedonian people.

To Greeks, as indeed to all foreign observers, these national and linguistic disputes of our northern neighbours, the question that is, of whether the inhabitants of the State of Skopje are Serbs or Bulgarians, whether their language is a distinct and separate one or just a Slavic dialect, whether the attempts made to develop it as a literary and scientific medium are right or wrong, whether its development and enrichment should rather be based on the Bulgarian or the Serb language etc. would have presented no more than purely scientific interest, they would have been regarded as «other people's business», as an internal problem of our neighbours, entirely devoid of any particular significance for our nation, if as might have been expected, the discussion had been limited to the linguistic and ethnological problems beyond our frontiers and if the ultimate objective had not been directed at Greek Macedonia itself. The Greeks, both as a nation and as a State, have faced the national and political alienation of territories which for thousands of years had been part of their national patrimony with a sense of realism and a great deal of historical understanding. Where

they have been unable to stop the penetration and ethnological domination by foreigners, especially the Slavisation of Northern Macedonia, they accepted this sacrifice of very considerable remains of Greek blood and culture, of towns and villages that were Greek since time immemorial, as an accomplished and irrevocable fact. More, they have sincerely endeavoured to cooperate with their neighbours in the arena of peaceful emulation for the sake of progress. They would therefore have no difficulty in remaining unconcerned in the face of these present problems, if our northern neighbours showed a similar spirit and understanding of our own historical rights, if they were content to keep the lands, the blood, the culture they usurped in the course of centuries, and leave us in peace in the little corner of our ancient homeland, to which their rapacity as a chief factor of historical developments, has confined us.

CHAPTER X

ARGUMENTS PUT FORWARD BY THE SLAVS TO SUPPORT THEIR CLAIM ON GREEK MACEDONIA

A. The argument regarding the name«Macedonians-Macedonia»

We have seen that the name Macedonia was assigned to Southern Servia, whose inhabitants had hitherto been called *Bulgari* by the Bulgarians and *Bugari* by the Serbs. This name was arbitrarily applied by Panslav propaganda with the devilish purpose of using it as an argument in support of the annexation of Greek Macedonia by the State of Skopje. But that the Slavs should give themselves the name «Macedonians», that they should call their newly founded state «Macedonia» is no less inappropriate and historically unacceptable, than if the Turks who now inhabit the lands of ancient Ionia and Aeolia, decided to call themselves Ionians and Aeolians respectively and on the strength of those names endeavoured to establish a claim on any geographical extension of the ancient Ionians and Aeolians into Greek territory.

And yet it is on the basis of this argument that the Slavs of Skopje claim as their national heritage the entire geographical region of Macedonia, the so-called «Aegean Macedonia», which has been peopled since remotest antiquity, through the Middle Ages to this very day by an uninterrupted succession of Greek generations.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

The Slavs choose to ignore the fact that in those remote times when the genuine Greek names «Macedonian, Macedonia, Aegean Sea», what they now so fondly call «Egejska Makedonija», came into use, their own ancestors lived in some unknown Russian steppe.

This habit to appropriate foreign names for political purposes, is by no means new. In an attempt to unite the Yugoslavs, from 1830 to 1850, the Croats assumed the name «Illyrian» and fought for political and national ends under this foreign, pre-slavic appellation. The Slavs of Skopje to-day are doing exactly the same with the pre-slavic name «Macedonian».[14]

If the historical and national rights of peoples are decided in this fashion, then who could deny the Greeks the right to reverse the argument of the Slavs and to argue with equal logic, that since the Greeks have saved the southern part of Macedonia from Slavisation and kept it ethnologically and linguistically Greek, indeed a trustee of Greek civilization, just as the ancient Macedonians were trustees, members and promoters of Greek civilisation the world over, and since furthermore the inhabitants of Greek Macedonia are historically and ethnologically the heirs and successors of ancient Macedonians, it is to this Greek Macedonia that its northern, Yugoslav, extension should be annexed whether or not it is inhabited to day by many Greeks; and it is in fact inhabited by approximately two millions of pure and nationally conscious Greeks.

The Greeks nevertheless have accepted the present ethnological reality in the Balkan peninsula and respect the new rights which history has created de facto in this part of the world. They make no claims on the northern, Slavophone parts of Macedonia, and recognise as an accomplished fact the situation which history has created to their disadvantage. They ask no more than that their northern neighbours should themselves realise that the extent of provocation for which they have been responsible has reached the limit. «There are limits which ought to be respected» or else who could ever put an end to this vicious circle of mutual malice?

The Greeks and all sensible and objective people, whatever their nationality, regard the fate of Macedonia as decided once and for all. Macedonia has been divided by the sword of history ethnologically, linguistically and politically into two zones: A) the Slavic zone which to-day is contained in the State of Skopje and the Pirin region

14. *M. Laskaris*: Τὸ ἀνατολικὸν ζήτημα - 1800/1923. (Thessaloniki 1948), I, 209.

in the south-western part of Bulgaria and B) the Greek zone which forms part of the Hellenic State. The latter is inhabited solely by Greeks. It has resisted Slavic penetration. The former can no longer claim a substantial Greek population. It is inhabited chiefly by Slavs whose right it is to attribute any name they like to themselves, if only a greater respect for their racial origins taught them to refrain from using a name so doubtlessly Greek and so closely bound up with the glorious past of Greece, as is the name of Macedonia.

The Macedonians, as is well known, spoke Greek at least from the 5th century B.C. onwards even if we accept for a moment that their language was not, originally, some older Hellenic dialect as indeed we now know for sure that it was. The Macedonians clung to Hellenic culture and according to Polybius (9,35), the ancient historian, «they never ceased fighting in defense of the security of the Greeks». Their names are well-known to us, they are all pure Greek and none is Thracio-Illyrian or Slavic. How, then, could the people who from the time they first set foot on Greek lands and throughout the Middle Ages and the period of Turkish rule were linguistically, culturally and politically Slavs, who ignored completely the geographical name Macedonia, who before the Balkan wars sent Bulgarian representatives to the Turkish Parliament, how could these people become Macedonians overnight? How can they reconcile their new Greek name with either their Slavic language or their fanatical hatred of everything Greek? But this is not all; the western region of the State of Skopje is inhabited by 164.000 Albanians who consider themselves both linguistically and in every other respect part of the Albanian nation. Are these Macedonians too? If so why not call by the same name the 200.000 Turcophones, the Gypsies and the Armenians? Why not attribute this national name to the Vlachs? But then we should first have to fashion a new definition of historical and ethnological concepts.

B. The argument of territorial and economic unity.

The Slavs of the State of Skopje, lost up till now in the welter of Greeks, Albanians, Vlachs, Turks and Gypsies who, during the Byzantine era and later under Turkish rule composed the population of southern Servia, never had a trace of national conscience. The struggle for liberation against Ottoman domination left them completely unmoved. The call to freedom trumpeted by the Greeks to all Christian nations of the Balkan peninsula at the beginning of the 19th century resulted in the liberation of a part of Greek territories

ΕΘΝΙΚΗ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

and the establishment of the modern Greek state, failed to wake them from their sleep. Devoid of national consciousness, devoid of culture and of a tradition of independent statehood, they naturally lacked the scientific background necessary to the study of the particular political and historical problems of their country. Since the Treaty of San Stephano until recently, the representatives of Slav aggressive nationalism and expansionism in the Balkan peninsula were the Bulgarians. But when in the troubled period of German occupation of the Balkans, during World War II, the Cominform proclaimed Macedonia an independent State, these people took up the ready-made Bulgarian slogans for a united Macedonia and have since been using them blindly and slavishly. Whoever would refute their arguments, must therefore answer the Bulgarians rather than the scholars of Skopje.

According to the Serb geographer, J. Cvijič[15] the Slav Valley of Morava and the Greek Valley of the river Axios constitute a geographical unit. Consequently, so the argument goes, the two should constitute a single -and of course Slav- political entity. This is obviously an untenable theory for how is it possible to set national boundaries by the flow of rivers, or by the orientation of the plains and valleys? Valleys had a decisive influence in shaping national entities only in the stone age when lack of communications resulted unavoidable isolation. It is absurd to argue today that frontiers should be defined by the unity of rivers, valleys and plains. The whole of the world nowadays forms a geographical and economic unit. The only conceivable boundaries at present are those running along the lines dividing different linguistic and national groups. Besides, modern means of communication have changed these geographical features from dividing lines into links for the exchange of material and cultural goods between different nations and states.

The towns and villages of the Axios valley south of its tributary Erogan are and have always been -in antiquity and through the Middle Ages and to this day- ethnologically Greek, whereas north of that river they were Illyrian in ancient times, then Greek, and later on predominantly Slavic. It can clearly be seen that the geographical unity of that valley failed to determine its national and political unity in the past; it could much less determine such a unity today. Commercially and economically, the ever Greek valley of the lower Axios is linked with the ports of the Aegean and with the nation

15. *J. Cvijič*: La pĕninsule balkanique (Paris 1918).

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

which for thousands of years has inhabited the Aegean coast. Th valley of the upper Axios and of Morava is linked with the norther Balkan region and the Danube. It would be interesting to learn fro the intellectual and political leaders of the State of Skopje when the people first heard of the existence of the Aegean Sea and what people glory it was that the Aegean waves cradled ever since, and long befor the beginning of history on the European continent.

C. The argument about the alleged Slavic character of th whole of Macedonia.

The argument regarding the name «Macedonian», «Macedonia» is really only a pretext and is only put forward accessorily. The on argument on which they insist is the ethnological one, namel that Macedonia did not belong to the Hellenic world in antiquity and that during the Middle Ages it had become thoroughly Sla Let us examine these arguments in turn. 1) The Slavs persist in rega ding the ancient Macedonians as Thracio-Illyrians, i.e. a race whic though Indo-European itself, was however quite distinct from th ancient Hellenes. It is well known that the ancient Macedonians cons dered themselves Greeks and what is known of their language conform entirely with Greek as a centum language, and differs fundamentall from Thracio - Illyrian which is a satem language. Like other Greeks they chose the Attic dialect as the official language of their State, circumstance which would have been inconceivable had their previou idiom not been a Greek dialect. While they were constantly at wa with the Thracio-Illyrians, they invariably defended the Helleni world and it was the Greek civilisation and language that they enforce in the Eastern and Mediterranean regions they conquered. Wha more should they have done to convince us that they were Greeks No objective and bona fide historian to-day questions the Greek ethno logical character of the ancient Macedonians. The great linguist P Kretschmer in his book «Sprache» (p. 87) maintains that the ancien Macedonians were a tribe which broke away from the main bod of the Greek nation and settled at an early stage in the mountainou country which is situated to the north of Thessaly.And the historia O. Reche in his book «Rasse und Heimat der Indogermanen» (p. 54 writes that the Macedonians followed the Dorians as the last of suc cessive waves of Hellenic migrations into the Greek peninsula. Th only question to-day is to know to what extent its language receive foreign admixtures as a result of the contacts which the ancient Mace

donians established with the Thracio-Illyrian tribes which they conquered. This we readily admit but will insist that it is irrelevant in a discussion of the Greek character and consciousness of the Macedonian people.

In order to support their contentions that ever since the Middle Ages, when they first appeared in the Balkan peninsula, they have never settled on Greek territory, but have only encountered and assimilated Thracio-Illyrian tribes, - for which reason they regard themselves as the heirs of historical and racial Thracio - Illyrian rights in the Balkans - the Slavs disregard all evidence of the Greekness of the ancient Macedonians. They further refuse to admit the universally accepted fact that the Macedonians as an undoubtedly Greek-speaking group - at least from the 5th century onwards - gradually hellenised the majority of Thracio-Illyrians in the Balkan peninsula, with the result during the Alexandrian, Roman and Byzantine eras, the Balkan was a Greek peninsula; a fact which is amply illustrated by the Greek inscriptions preserved in those regions. On the basis of these inscriptions, the Czech historian Cj. Jireček[16] traced the well-known line which bears his name. The Jireček line marking the limits of the Hellenic civilisation and language in the Balkans at least up to the 7th century A.D. runs from the mouth of the river Skumbi on the Adriatic sea through Skopje and Serdika (contemporary Sofia) and eastward along the Aemos range to the Black sea.

According to Jireček who was neither a Greek nor a Philhellene, but a Slav who respected historical truth, the whole area of the present State of Skopje belonged to the sphere of Greek language and culture - at least down to the 7th century A. D. that is when the presence of the Slavs in the Greek peninsula first made itself felt.

It was Greeks, then, both linguistically and culturally, not Thracio-Illyrians that the Slavs met in the Balkans, and Greeks that they strove to assimilate as the large number of Greek words in their language shows. The Slavs did not come into contact with Thracio-Illyrians, firstly because the latter had disappeared a long time before; secondly, because the Slav languages in the Balkan peninsula have not preserved any Thracio-Illyrian elements as they certainly would have, if the Thracio-Illyrian language had been alive at the time when the Slavs invaded the Balkans. By contrast, Slav languages

16. C. J. *Jireček*: Die Romanen in den Städten Dalmatiens während des Mittelalters I, 13.

ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

have several Hellenic admixtures which are proof that the only people whom the Slavs encountered in the Balkans were Greeks.

2) The Slavs insist on exaggerating both the duration and the importance of the consequences of the Slavic occupation of Greek Macedonia during the Middle Ages by Serb and Bulgarian rulers. The Slavs first entered the Balkans as mercenaries of the Avars, during the 6th century A.D. It was only after the defeat of the Avars in Constantinople that they began to settle sporadically as peaceful peasants south of the Danube. These sporadic and peaceful settlements continued in the 7th and 8th centuries. That the Byzantine empire, then at the height of its power, tolerated these Slav settlements on the southern bank of the Danube is in itself proof of the fact that the Slav immigrants were numerically few and in their quality as peaceful peasants presented no threat to the safety of the State. Thessaloniki, the great metropolis of Macedonian Greekdom, «towered over the Slavs as a great military and civilising power armed with the sword and the gospel » as Rambaud[17] writes epigrammatically. The Serbs who undoubtedly had more Illyrian blood in their veins, were relatively less war-like people who «ever submitted to the rule of neighbourly powers» as the historical writer Choniatis[18] says. So long as Byzantium was powerful, it had nothing to fear from them. It was only with the decline of the Byzantine Empire under the Angeli, that the Serb leader Stepan Nemania (1331-1355) and his dynasty were able to found a viable Serb State, to conquer Kastoria and Serrai in 1345 and to occupy Jannina and Thessaly (1348). That Stepan Nemania proclaimed himself Czar of the Serbs and the Greeks can be taken as evidence of the fact that in the middle of the 14th century, Macedonia south of Servia was Greek. For otherwise who could be Stepan Nemania's Greek subjects? Greek inscriptions in Western Macedonia[19] during that period abundantly show that even under Serb occupation the dominant language was Greek and that the Greek element continued to predominate as a race in Macedonia.

17. *Rambaud*: L' empire grec au Xe siècle, p. 235.

18. *N. Choniatis*: History, p. 23, 4 (Bonn): «Soon afterwards, he (the Emperor Ioannis Komnenos) conducted a military campaign against the nation of Trivalloi (or Serbs, as they are called by some) because they had committed crimes and had not respected the truce; and after they came to grips he defeated them completely and subdued them: these people were unfit for war, wherefore they were always subdued by neighbouring powers».

19. *Gelzer*: Byzantinische Inschriften aus Westmakedonien (Athen, Mitteilungen, 27, 431).

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

The half brother of Stepan Uresi III, Symeon Uresi, a Palaeologue on his mother's side, became the independent ruler of Epirus, Thessaly and southern Macedonia, with Trikala as his capital and Greeks as his subjects. Greek was the established language and in this official documents were written. But John Uresi, Symeon's son, became a monk by the name of Ioasaf in Mount Athos and Meteora and the Serb occupation of the above mentioned Greek regions, lasted for a decade only. The other Serb ruler John Uglesi, local governor of Eastern Macedonia with Serrai as his capital, is known to have broken away from the Serb State, separated his church from the Serb Patriarchate of Peč, and joined it to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The Greek Byzantine civilisation and the compact Greek population of the country under their rule, always exerted an irresistible assimilating influence on the Serb princes.

The only thing that the Serbs achieved as a result of their temporary expansion in Greek Byzantine territories, was to undermine the power of the Byzantine Empire, when it was fighting the Turks in Asia Minor. Thus, in contributing to its downfall, they also brought about their own subjugation which was complete by 1371, their territories having been conquered by the Turks while some parts of Byzantium, then the only Christian bulwark in the Balkans, still resisted destruction.

It should, however, be noted that though the short-lived territorial expansion into Greek regions was not only useless from the point of view of the history of Christendom and Civilisation, but even prejudiced the common cause of Christianity in the face of the conquering fury of Turkish Islam, though by undermining the defensive strength of Byzantium, (the only power that stood between their own civilisation and Asian barbarism), precipitated their own enslavement, the Slavs during their invasions of Greek territories were never as blood-thirsty, cruel and destructive to Greek populations[20] as were the Bulgarians.

The Bulgarians were by heredity and tradition a nation of nomads, to whom productive economy was unknown. Thus it often happened that as soon as the loot taken through pillage of Greek villages was consumed, their country was again stricken by famine, and famine urged them on to new incursions. Pillage, cruelty and abduction of Greeks to the north of the Aemos range where the Bulgarians established a

20. *K. Amantos*: Ἱστορικαὶ σχέσεις Ἑλλήνων, Σέρβων καὶ Βουλγάρων Athens 1949, p. 68.

ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΥ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

base, were common in the Balkan regions of the Byzantine state during the period of the old Bulgarian State since it was established by Asparuch in 679 A.D. until under Basil II it became once more a Byzantine province. In 977 Samuel, the son of Count Nicolaus, contrived by bringing together all the Boyars that were discontented against the Bulgarian ruler Peter, to create a small State in Northern Macedonia. From there he invaded Thessaly, and faithful to Bulgarian practice, he deported the Greek inhabitants of Larissa to Prespa and Ochris. His rule over purely Greek countries, however was very short, for his activities, brought against him the wrath of the Byzantines and accelerated his death and the downfall of his country at the sword of Basil II in 1014. After this, Bulgaria again became a Byzantine province and remained so until 1186. Ochris, Samuel's capital, was restored as a centre of Greek civilisation, as is shown by the famous inscriptions of the church of St. Achillius on the island of Prespa. The country south of Aemos remained ethnologically and linguistically Greek throughout the Middle Ages. The Bulgarian predominance there had merely the character of robber incursions, undertaken only when the Byzantine empire, engaged in a life or death struggle on other fronts, left its rear uncovered. The present Slavophone population of southern Bulgaria is descended from Greeks who, as a result of the legendary Bulgarian cruelty, were slowly assimilated, and from north Bulgarian settlers who proceeded southwards during the years of Turkish occupation when the whole of the Balkan peninsula was open to population movements. It was during Ottoman rule that small scale infiltrations of Slavs occurred in Greek Macedonia with a result that a few unimportant Slavophone villages were founded, villages, which the Bulgarians to-day cite in support of their expansionist claims as if they constituted the ancient cradle of their nationality.

The Bulgarians have nothing to show to prove that they made a contribution, either during the Byzantine era, or during the Turkish occupation, to the civilisation of the country whose nationals they have tried for centuries, by sword and fire to drive out of their ancient homesteads. After their conversion to Christianity, the Bulgarians modelled their language on Greek and acquired a literature by translating the works of Greek writers. They learnt from the Greeks the art of urban living and inhabited exclusively Greek towns, where by assimilating the willing and cruelly persecuting the unwilling, they succeeded in enforcing their nationality. In these towns the Bulgarians now display the works produced by Greek hands with the

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

Greek sense of beauty as works of their own alleged ancient civilisation.

The one and only contribution by the Bulgarians to the fates of the Balkan was that by robbery, pillage, abduction, criminal acts of cruelty and horror of which the Byzantine historical writer Nikita Choniati wrote that they were such «as the ear had never heard, and the eye had never seen before », they impeded the civilising mission of the mediaeval Greek nation, undermined the strength of the sole defender of Christendom in the East and hastened its fall under the onslaught of the Asian conqueror. The Bulgarians themselves were first subdued by the Turks in 1393, 60 years before the capture of Constantinople.

D. The argument about the nationality of the inhabitants of Greek Macedonia to-day.

The claim on Greek Macedonia advanced by the Slavs of Skopje rests not only on an over-estimation of the Slav cultural and demographic factor, but also on summary dismissal of the present Greek ethnological element and on distortion of recent historical facts. These views find expression in Hristo Antonovski's new book, «Egejska Makedonija» (Skopje, year of publication not mentioned) which is full of historical inaccuracies.

It is well-known that the part of Macedonia which is now contained in the kingdom of Greece is inhabited by 2.000.000 people. (Census 1951). Of these, only 80.000 are bilingual Greeks. Those who had a Slav conscience departed from Greece either under the Treaty of Neuilly, (1919)[21] or after the end of the guerilla war in 1949. Seeing that no serious claim could rest on a linguistic minority of this size in a country with so compact a Greek population, Antonovski decided to raise the number of Slavophones to 250.000. He distributes

21. *H. Morgenthau*: «I Was Sent to Athens» p. 304 writes: «The Turks and the Bulgarians... all left for their respective countries and left Macedonia purely Greek». Swire: «Bulgarian Conspiracy» (London 1939) p. 31 writes: «The Bulgarians emigrated from Macedonia voluntarily. They were not forced to do so. Bulgarian claims were cancelled and Macedonia became a Greek province». Busch Zantner writes: «Unter dem Vorwande volkspolitische Gesichtspunkte zu vertreten, kann heute Bulgarien auf Süd-Mazedonien keinen Anspruch mehr erheben». S. K. Macartney writes: «National States and National Minority» (London, 1934) p. 439: Southern Macedonia is constantly inhabited by true Greeks». (See :*Ch. Naltsas* ref. p. 522). For statistics about the percentage of Greek population in Macedonia before 1912 see the book by *Ch. K. Sotiropoulos*: Ἀπάντησις πρὸς Βορρᾶν (Athens, 1962) pp. 17. ff.

them by regions in the following proportions, as compared with the Greek-speaking population. Kastoria -72%, Kailaria -32%, Edessa -54,8%, Serrai -13%, Salonica -27,6%. But as even with this gross over-estimation the Greek majority in «Aegean Macedonia» remains overwhelming, Antonovski excludes from the Greek population the large number of Greek refugees who arrived from Asia Minor and settled in Macedonia, in 1923 under the Lausanne population exchange Treaty. He claims that they are not Greeks, but Karamanlides, pure Turks (tsisti Turtsi)[22] whom Turkey sent to Greece on the occasion of the exchange of populations because being Christian Orthodox they did not have a Turkish conscience. Turkey, according to Antonovski, wanted to be rid of them for that reason and at the same time because they might furnish Greece a pretext to claim on their behalf the Turkish territories they inhabited. Even the Pontian refugees, who are exlusively Greek-speaking and universally known to be the true descendants of the ancient Ionian settlers of the Black sea, he calls Lazoi. He assigns them as well as the refugees from Caucasus, who were themselves Pontian settlers, Turkish nationality. A hundred thousand of these refugees who settled in Greek Macedonia he describes as Armenian. He even discovered some Kurds among them!

It is hard to choose between his ignorance of historical facts and his impudence. For never since the Turks established their rule in Asia Minor, and by means of cruel persecution and oppression converted to Islam the majority of its Christian Greek population, never once did it happen that a Turk decided to become a Christian; that he exchanged his position of religious, economic and political power for subjection; that he chose to become a slave at a time when people born Christians gave up their religion for Islam because they were able no longer to suffer oppression and tyranny. But assuming that notwithstanding all this a Turk decided to take this step, how could he ever survive since death was the certain penalty for rejection of the dominant religion? Death was even meted out to those Christians whose conversion to Islam did not go beyond the surface if it were ever discovered that they practised Christianity stealthily (the well-known Crypto-Christians).[23] It is a shame in the face of the very science which they are trying for the first time to establish in their country that the Slavs of Skopje, though themselves Christians, have no scrup-

22. *Hr. Antonovski*: Egejska Makedonija p. 42.

23. *N. P. Andriotis*: Κρυπτοχριστιανική φιλολογία (Thessaloniki, 1953), *N. Milioris*: Οι Κρυπτοχριστιανοί (Athens 1962).

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

les about distorting history — even creating a university in their capital for that purpose—and about reviling that section of Greek Christendom which amidst tortures and under the cruellest yoke known to history, in preserving their Greek conscience have also managed to preserve the religion of Christ for centuries, and finally breathe the air of national and religious liberty on free Greek soil.

The Slavs of Skopje must know that many of their own fellow countrymen were compelled by Turkish oppression to embrace Islam. There are in that country today, as there are also in Bulgaria, many hundred thousand Mahommedan Slavs. But can they point to a single Christian Slav who had been a Turk and was converted to Christianity during the Ottoman rule? They insist that the Moslems of their country are Slav converts to Islam; they moan over the alleged fact that the Turks of Greek Macedonia who went to Turkey in consequence of the exchange of populations were in fact islamised Slavs[24]and their evacuation reduced the Slav element in the country; Why then do they refuse to accept the historically proven fact that a considerable number of Moslems in Asia Minor, Macedonia and Thrace were Greeks whom Turkish tyranny forced to embrace Islam but who to this day retain their Greek language? Such are the Ophites of Pontus, the Vallaades of Macedonia and the so-called Turco-Cretans. The original Turks were of Mongolian race, whilst all the Turks of Asia Minor and Europe to-day are white. Whence can these white Turks claim descent except from Christians, i.e., from Byzantine Greeks! And if it is admitted that white Turks are descended from Greeks, by what logic is it possible to argue that Greek-speaking Christians of Turkey are Turks, indeed pure Turks «tsisti turtsi» as the scholars of Skopje maintain?

But what can one expect from a science which has no tradition to respect and which from the very first was made to the measure of political expediency? In order to explain away the lack of any considerable Slavophone minority in Greek Macedonia, Hristo Antonovski does not hesitate to use the most preposterous arguments. He seriously maintains, for instance, that after the liberation of Greek Macedonia, the Slavophones were decimated by Spanish influenza, as though this essentially epidemic disease had a special preference for Slavs, and avoided Greeks. And he goes on to say (p. 55) that in Greek Macedonia to-day malaria, tuberculosis, psoriasis and eye diseases run havoc

24. *K. Amantos*: Μακεδονικὰ p. 65

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ

on the population, as if Greek medicine, the oldest in the whole of Europe and second to none in the Near East in modern times, had anything to learn from the newly founded university of Skopje.

Those among the few Vlachophones of Greek Macedonia who are oriented towards Greek education and Greek civilization, he calls Grecomani, i.e. Grecomaniacs. A name clearly implying a silent protest against the people who failed to foresee that in the middle of the 20th century a new State would rise in Skopje whose civilisation and glory would at once overshadow the oldest civilisation in the Greek peninsula. It is impossible to read such arguments without amusement and wonder at the degree of objectivity shown by the scholars of Skopje. The terms in which they couch their arguments are also characteristic. According to Antonovski some Vlachs fell (Propadnale) under Greek influence, others gained (Dobile) a Slavic conscience.[25] It is probable that the Vlachs are latinised Greeks. But let us suppose that they are not, and that they came from Dacia during the Byzantine era. The fact that they loved and admired, or even just showed respect for the culture and the civilisation of the people in whose midst they had come to live, is considered as a fall, as a decline! Adoption of Slav culture on the other hand, a culture which was non-existant - and that is precisely why the Slavs became «Grecomani» during the Byzantine period or under the Turkish rule - is regarded as a gain!

Antonovski (p. 56) describes in sinister terms the migration of 700.000 peasants from the border regions to the urban centers during the recent guerilla war. The writer knows of course, though he is careful not to admit it, that those peasants had nothing in common with the Slavophone minority and that this mass migration, so costly to the Greek nation as a whole, was made necessary in order to safeguard those peasants from imprisonment and the danger of being taken as hostages, or of seeing their children abducted by the Communist guerillas who were dissolved as soon as Yugoslavia ceased to tolerate them.

From the way in which Antonovski distorts recent events it is possible to surmise what treatment our ancient history receives at his hands. The name « Macedonia», he writes in the beginning of his book, appears in ancient times as that of the State of Macedonia. He conceals its Greek derivation from the Homeric adjective «Mace-dnos» (tall) from Macos (length) he thinks his readers had better not know any-

25. *Hr. Antonovski* reff. p. 44.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

thing about it, so he only says that it comes from the same root makas the Latin Magnus. In other words he begins from the very first page of his book with a falsification of facts. He does not say of what nationality these ancient Macedonians were and what language they spoke, for if he said it, he would be forced to admit that they were a Hellenic tribe and spoke a Hellenic dialect, or, at any rate did so from the 5th century B.C. when the Attic dialect became the official language in Macedonia and was spread by the Macedonians through the ancient world together with Greek civilisation; and that Greek has remained their language through the Roman and Byzantine ages, through the period of Turkish rule to this day. For if he admitted this truth, what sense would there be in the subsequent pages of his book where Macedonia is represented as a kind of common property with Slavs, Albanians, Vlachs and even Thracio-Illyrians moving freely about and Greeks conspicuously absent? How could he create the impression that this mixture of peoples just waited for the year of grace 1944 in order to let their national Macedonia heritage materialise?

In the distortion of history the Slavs of Skopje have proved themselves worthy disciples of the Bulgarians. It was «Bulgarian science» which seriously put forward the view that the Bulgarians were the oldest inhabitants of the Balkan peninsula; that they came from India, that they founded the oracle of Delphi, that Alexander the Great was a Bulgarian, that Paul the Apostle preached the gospel to Bulgarians and that Justinian, the Byzantine Emperor was a Slav etc.[26]

In their books, Antonovski and Lape present photographs of walls, temples, castles and other historical monuments of the Greek Macedonian cities.[27] They fail to explain that in building these monuments not a stone was contributed by Slavs, that the walls were constructed for the express purpose of defending those cities against the attacks and pillages of the Slavs, that the murals in those churches portray the victories of Greece against Slavs and Saints assisting the Greeks in their defensive wars against the Slav attacks. Of the history of those towns that well-meaning Antonovski has nothing more to say than what is related with the insignificant and transitory presence of Slavs. Of Thessaloniki, for instance, he knows only that the first press was established there during the Turkish occupation, as well as the first Slav

26. *St. Kyriakidis*: The Northern Ethnological Boundaries of Hellenism. (Thessaloniki, 1955) pp. 13 ff.

27. *Hr. Antonovski* ref. pp. 8, 12, 40, 56, 64, *Ljuben Lape*: Odbrami Tsetva za istorijata na makedonskiot narod (Skopje 1952) pp. 16, 19, 41, 42, 57, 67.

ΙΔΡΥΣΙΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

school in 1869 and the first and last Slavic gymnasium in 1880 in addition to the fact that the town served as headquarters for the BMPO-Komitadji. Of the monasteries of Mount Athos he knows that they possess manuscripts that are invaluable for Balkan history, but in what language these documents are written he does not feel it incumbent upon him to say.

The struggles which the Greeks of Macedonia fought in order to defend themselves against the threat of extermination by Panslavism, Antonovski will not regard as national struggles. He describes them as the result of the activities of Turkish Government Agents. In other words he denies the Greeks of Macedonia both national feeling and the desire to survive the danger of national annihilation.

Speaking of the economic life of Greek Macedonia under the Turkish rule, Antonovski uses corrupt Slav versions of the original Greek place-names in order to create the impression that he is referring to Slav territories; he speaks for instance of Soloun, instead of Thessaloniki, of Kostur, instead of Kastoria, of Voden, instead of Edessa and so on. Furthermore, he can think of no other contributors to the industrial and commercial development of Macedonia, except the Slavs, the Tsindzars and the Turks. No mention is made of the Greeks, although Greek predominance on the economic scene in the area is universally known. He is blissfully innocent of the mass execution of Greek Macedonians by Bulgarian Komitadji and chooses to ignore the fact that they deliberately murdered Turks in the proximity of Greek villages in order to provoke the wrath of Turkish authorities against the Greek population. He is also unaware that during the Balkan wars and during the two World Wars, the Bulgarians, proceeded with the wholesale murder of Greeks, the taking of men as hostages and the devastation of Greek villages. He knows nothing of all these atrocities, for the result was precisely what the Slavs desired. His humanitarian sentiment is only moved by the thought that the separation of Greek Macedonia from Serb and Bulgarian Macedonia deprived the former of the many economic advantages which it enjoyed under the Turkish rule when the whole of the Balkan peninsula formed a single economic unit. He would have us believe that a new prosperity awaits the people of Greek Macedonia if only their region were united with the Slav Macedonias to the north. But even if this were true, is national freedom, the highest good in life, to be bargained against economic advantages?

Yet we Greeks continue to take these people seriously and to fear

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

in our discussions with them, lest we should advance an argument not strictly in accordance with historical evidence. They are people who, in the name of Communism, have abandoned as bourgeois superstition all respect for what we regard as sacred, for historical truth and national justice. Their creed is contained in the principles propounded by Lenin in 1919: «It will be essential for us to have recourse to any stratagems. We shall not hesitate to use falsehood. By deceit, illegality and craft we will ensure the concealment of truth... so long as capitalism survives we cannot live in peace. In the end one side or other will triumph...but until that happens, the important thing is to learn to be deceitful and flexible».[28]

One might wonder whether it is worthwhile to attach so much importance to proving the incorrectness of a book, even if it is one of bad faith. The answer is that Antonovski's book is not the only one of its kind for several others have been published with the selfsame objective of furthering expansionist aims by distorting the judgment of people with historical untruth.

I am not competent to deal with the political aspect of the threat which the State of Skopje presents to Greek Macedonia, I will refer the reader to an excellent book on this subject by *A.A. Kyrou*: «*Our Balkan Neighbours*» (*Athens 1962*) and will restrict myself to quoting a few passages which show, beyond any doubt, the official attitude of that country on the subject with which we are concerned. Prime Minister Lazar Kolisefsky declared in 1945 that «the unification of the whole of Macedonia within the limits of Tito's Yugoslavia was amongst the objectives of the Popular front of Macedonia from the very first day of its creation»[28a] Tito's close and trusted collaborator, Mosha Pijade, made it clear at the Paris Peace Conference where he acted as leader of the Yugoslav delegation that «it is our intention to bring up the question of Aegean Macedonia... It is time that this lamentable question (the Macedonian problem) were solved in a way which would allow these peoples (of Greek, and Bulgarian Macedonia) to unite and enjoy in national unity the freedom and independence which only citizens of the people's Macedonian republic of the Yugoslavian Federation enjoy to-day.[28b] Kolisefsky's collaborator D. Vlachof, said

28. *Ch. Naltsas*: Τὸ Μακεδονικὸν ζήτημα κλπ. p. 527

28a. For the political aspect of the menace from the State of Skopje today against Greek Macedonia see *A.A. Kyrou*: Οἱ Βαλκανικοὶ γείτονές μας (Athens 1962) pp. 202 ff. and Ch. *K. Sotiropoulos* ref pp. 41 ff.

28b. See *A.A. Kyrou* ref. pp. 202 ff.

ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΝ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

in 1946 :«We declare emphatically that Greece has absolutely no right on the Aegean Macedonia... the Macedonian nation is fighting for its unification with the Macedonian People's Republic which constitutes an inseparable part of the federation of popular republics». It is D. Vlachof's contention, in other words, that two million Greeks of Macedonia strive for unification with the State of Skopje, a thing that has surely never entered their minds and the mention of which they would repudiate with indignation. Leaving aside national pride and dignity what sort of state would emerge from this plan for unification: a Greek or a Slav State and on what national languages, and on what culture would that State be founded, on the Greek majority element, or on the Slavo-Turco - Albano-Gipsy minority?. It is enough to mention but the latest work of Lazar Kolisefski, Prime Minister of the State of Skopje, «La Question Nationale Macédonienne» (Beograd, 1959) to show to what extent the official Government has adopted and taken upon itself to propagate those views. All historical, linguistic and demographic facts are lightly waved aside by the statement «nous sommes des communistes, des marxistes, et *non des* pragmatistes... Les Communistes yougoslaves ont toujours puisé leur force... dans le fait qu'ils ont posé des objectifs politiques concordant profondément avec les aspirations des peuples, avec les lois objectives du développement social et national» (p. 10) in other words «Do not talk to us about reason and historical truth». «It may well be» he writes (p. 11) «that many of our ancestors considered themselves Bulgarians, Serbs or Greeks. There is no need for us to conceal the fact or to be ashamed of it. We cannot, for the sake of a bourgeois method of history-writing, determine history on the basis of one piece of fact or another taken separately, when such facts contradict the combined whole of objective historical laws and their results», which is as much as to say: «We have established a state, we have named it Macedonia, whatever is not in conformity with this fact is mere vain talk.»

CHAPTER XI

THE CREATION OF CLAIMS AGAINST GREEK MACEDONIA

The Slavs of the Balkan Peninsula were slow in developing a national consciousness. When, in the 19th century, the Greeks from Moldavia to Cyprus had risen in revolt against the Turks and were fight-

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

ing the common oppressor of all Eastern Christian peoples, the Slavs not only had no part in the struggle, they did not even realise what it was all about. «Their national sentiment was dormant», writes the Bulgarian L. Ognianof. To them the nation was their village or «zadruga». It was only when the Russians discovered that their policy of expansion southwards, towards the Mediterranean, would be easier to carry out if the Balkan Slavs were freed from Turkish domination, and organised in autonomous states, that they began to develop a national conscience. The Russians deliberately fostered Slav nationalism in the hope that linguistic affinities and a sense of gratitude for their comfortable and bloodless liberation would render them serviceable to the extension of Russian influence in the Balkans. The Russians also realised that the neutralisation of the Greek element as an important force in the Near East and the Balkans was essential for the fulfillment of Russian ambitions. The plan was conceived, accordingly, to create in the Balkans a powerful and submissive instrument of Russian policy -Greater Bulgaria- which, after the subjection of the Greeks in European Turkey, would include in its confines the greater part of Greek Thrace and the whole of Greek Macedonia.

It should be noted that support for the Russian plans for the destruction of the Greek populations within Greater Bulgaria came paradoxically from British policy. For Britain, though opposed to Russian expansionism, compelled free Greece, then a small and weak state, to lull the anxieties of the Greek population of Turkey and obstructed in every way its rise against the Russian plans. The reason for this British policy was the fear that Turkey, finding herself between two threats might give way to Russian power; this would mean the breaking of the last powerful dam that held back the Russian flood rushing to the Mediterranean. The abortive Treaty of San Stephano in 1877, which created Greater Bulgaria, contradicted any sense of historic and national justice. Had it ever come into force, had the plan conceived by the Russians at the moment of their victory against the Turks ever been put into effect, its consequences for Macedonian Greekdom would have been as disastrous as those of the annexation to Bulgaria of the province of Eastern Roumelia were for the Greek population which constituted two-thirds of the country's Christian community and within a few decades had virtually ceased to exist. Fortunately, the Treaty of San Stephano was annulled at the Berlin Conference in 1878 and the Greeks of Macedonia escaped a dismal fate. But the memory of that convention remains alive in Bulgarian national dreams.

It nursed Bulgarian greed, assisted Panslav expansionism and furnished both the motive and the excuse for every Slav act of aggression against Greece during the last eighty-seven years.[29] With the creation of the State of Skopje, the leadership of Slav expansionism was taken away from the Bulgarians, but the policy followed has remained substantially unchanged.

Needless to say, the Bulgarians have not invariably been faithful to their Russian benefactors. Indeed, during the first and second World Wars, they were the allies of Russia's enemies. The Russians, however, attach little importance to these transient Bulgarian moods. It is sufficient for their purposes that whatever the form that Slav expansionism may take, whether it be promoted by a country named Bulgaria, or Servia, or Slav Macedonia the result will be broadly the same: the diffusion of the Slavic language, the southward move of the Slavs to the Mediterranean[30] and with it, today, something even more important, the further spreading of the Communist curtain. For that reason, at the end of World War II, the USSR not only hastened to protect a defeated Bulgaria against the justified wrath of the victorious powers, but also tried hard to perpetuate Bulgarian occupation of those parts of northern Greece which Hitler had given Bulgaria as a reward for her services to the Axis, her hostility to the cause of the western powers and of Russia. To this day it has encouraged the Bulgarian refusal to pay damages for the destruction carried out in Greek territories during the war or even to return the property which Bulgarians took away from the areas they had occupied. Such is the extent of Panslav fanaticism and the tolerance of Communist opportunism.

The same Panslav fanaticism and Communist opportunism are at the root of Russia's support for the Macedonian ambitions of the infant State of Skopje, notwithstanding any ill effects this policy might have on her former favourite, Bulgaria. For, in the last analysis, what is the objective of the State of Skopje if not the southward drive of Panslavism and Communism towards the Aegean, the same expansion which Russia had sought to achieve at San Stephano by means of a Greater Bulgaria. The ultimate goal has always remained unchanged: to drive the Greeks away from their homeland in the southern-most part of Europe and to extend the Iron Curtain to the Mediterranean.

29. *Ch. Naltsas*: Ἡ συνθήκη τοῦ Ἁγ. Στεφάνου καὶ ὁ Ἑλληνισμὸς (Thessaloniki, 1953)
30. *Ch. Naltsas* ref. p. 304

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

The history of peoples, past glories, national rights and «such other high sounding words» earn nothing but sarcasm from the Soviet Cominform especially when they concern non-Slavic peoples.

Speaking of the expansionist policy of the Slavs of Skopje, a policy directed primarily against Greek Macedonia, it is impossible not to remember the policies of Serbs and Bulgarians whose slogans and catchwords the State of Skopje has now adopted as its own. After the Bulgarian schism (1870) and in order to limit and to neutralise the effects of the Great Bulgaria ideology which inspired the Bulgarian exarchate, the Serbs at first strove to stress and to strengthen the idea of the linguistic peculiarities of the Slavophones of Macedonia. When later on, however, in 1895 they became aware of the fact that this led to the development of a powerful national sentiment among the Macedonian Slavophones, they swiftly abandoned the idea of Slavo-Macedonian linguistic peculiarism and became adepts of the view that Macedonia never existed except as a simple geographical term. They proclaimed that neither a nation, nor a language which could properly be called Macedonian existed and that the country under that name was inhabited by three separate nationalities, the Serbs, the Bulgarians and the Greeks. They tried to impose their language on those peoples.[30a] This however, did not stop them in 1944 from approving the creation of the People's Democracy of Macedonia as one of the Federal Republics of Yugoslavia. Nor does it stop them to-day from giving support to any expansionist move that may be directed against Greek Macedonia.

The Bulgarians again, whenever the state of world affairs does not favour their attempts to annex the whole of Macedonia, Greek and Slav, advance the theory that its peoples constitute a separate nation which can only secure its rights through autonomy. They ask for autonomy because they consider it as a safe stepping-stone to the final incorporation of Macedonia into Bulgaria. The precedent of Eastern Roumelia once predominantly Greek and now part of Bulgaria was precisely such a step. «Pour qu'il y ait la paix dans les Balkans il faut qu'il y ait une Macédoine libre, indépendante et éternellement neutre» writes Krainikowski.[31] Needless to say that support for Macedonian autonomy in no way prevents Bulgarians from making an exception of the people of the province of Pirin Macedonia

30a. See: *L. Kolisefski*: La question nationale macédonienne (Beograd 1959) p. 21.

31. *A. Krainikowski*: La question de Macédoine et la diplomatie Européenne (Paris 1938) p. 300.

ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΟ ΚΕΝΤΡΟ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

whom they regard as pure Bulgarian and carefully avoid mentioning among Bulgaria's national minorities.[32] In other words they act on the principle that «mine is mine and yours must be mine». When the world situation favoured their expansionist aims and raised Bulgarian hopes of annexing Macedonia by force, they forgot and repudiated the doctrine of a distinct Macedonian nation and the idea of Macedonian autonomy. That was the case during the Second World War when in 1941 Hitler's army invaded Yugoslavia and Greece. The Bulgarians, as Germany's allies, were allowed to take possession of the Greek and Yugoslav parts of Macedonia. Presently they proceeded to settle considerable numbers of people brought from Bulgaria. To those people they turned over the wealth and productive resources of the country. They forced the native inhabitants, whether Greeks or Slavs, to take Bulgarian names and pursued with fanaticism a policy of destruction of all things which seemed to contradict their claim that the country was Bulgarian in character. The Bulgarian outrages in Greek Macedonia during the Byzantine era, the atrocities «unheard by the human ear, unseen by the human eye» as the Byzantine historian said, have already been referred to. The record of Bulgarian occupation of Serbia was not much different. After Yugoslavian Macedonia was occupied in May 1941, every attempt was made to destroy Serb elements. The Bulgarians founded 800 Bulgarian schools and trained 600 school-teachers in Bulgaria for the purpose of teaching the people that Macedonia was the cradle (!) of the Bulgarian nation. They also established in Skopje a Bulgarian college and a Bulgarian national theatre and proclaimed all Macedonians pure Bulgarians. When the issue of the Second World War once more frustrated their plans, the Bulgarians reverted to the doctrine of the separate Macedonian nation. Apart from all kinds of relevant publications appearing in Bulgaria, they circulate abroad an English-language review under the title «Macedonia» and the motto «Macedonia for Macedonians». The title appears to the left of a map which portrays as a national and political entity the whole of the Yugoslav, Bulgarian and Greek Macedonias. Quite recently, however, believing that the Greek position, which maintains that a Macedonian nation does not exist, that the State of Skopje is wrongly called «Macedonia» and its inhabitants wrongly called Macedonians since they are in fact Bulgarians, can be turned to their own advantage, they have chan-

32. *Ch. Naltsas* ref. p. 517.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

ged their tune and maintain officially that for them the Macedonian question does not exist any longer, that the Greeks accordingly will have nothing to fear if the State of Skopje is incorporated in Bulgaria. It would be an error to allow ourselves to be deceived by such opportunist statements and to be led to forget the proverbial Bulgarian faithlessness. The Bulgarians have never abandoned the hope of a Greater Bulgaria. The treaty of San Stephano is still at the back of the minds of the country's Communist leaders who consider it a «fair solution». It is more than certain that should the Bulgarians ever succeed in annexing the State of Skopje they would soon turn against Greek Macedonia again.

It is typical of the national sentiment, the character and way of thinking of the people of the State of Skopje that as they never protested or resisted its incorporation in the Greater Bulgaria of San Stephano they also welcomed the Serb occupation which made it a Serbian province after the Balkan wars, and registered no reaction against the Bulgarian invasion in World War II. No wonder that it accepted with perfect equanimity the proclamation of the country as the Macedonia of the Vardar and its status as one of the members of the Republic of Yugoslavia. Successive occupations have impeded the development of a national orientation. Having no historical memory, they cannot know how little relevance there exists between that conglomeration of Slavs, Vlachs, Albanians, Turks and Gipsies and the names Macedonia and Macedonian. Equally as a result of their ignorance of Greek history, the people of the State of Skopje grossly underestimate the determination of the Greeks to defend their national heritage now and forever. Having never experienced freedom they were turned into passive instruments of Panslav expansionist schemes. Being unaware of the danger they have no fear of the nemesis keeping watch over that Aegean Sea, which they have never seen and towards which they are urged on by their rulers.

The policies of Sofia and Skopje and behind them that of great Panslavism[33] show surprising continuity despite internal and tempo-

33. According to the Panslav Doctrine, Slav peoples, in order to accomplish their historical mission must unite in a federation extending from the Adriatic to the Pacific Ocean and from the Arctic Sea to the Aegean, under the leadership of Russia. For the birth of Panslavism see *M. Laskaris*: Τὸ Ἀνατολικὸν Ζήτημα 1800/1923, I, 238 ff. Ἱστορία. Cf. *A. I. Papadatis*: Ἀγῶνες καὶ δίκαια τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ τῆς Ἀν. Ρωμυλίας, Athens 1948 in the chapter: «The Conception of the Panslav Dream» pp. 27-56.

rary changes. Their principal objective has always remained the same. The annexation of Greek Macedonia and Thrace and the cultural and linguistic assimilation of its people to the Slavs. For that reason the attitude of Greece, both as a nation and as a State, toward all forms of Slav threat remains the same, always.

Greece has no claims on either Bulgarian or Yugoslav Macedonia. It readily recognises and respects as final the present linguistic, ethnological and political reality of Macedonia which, besides, has been sanctioned by a series of International conventions. For the sake of peace in the Balkans it is prepared to overlook the many sacrifices it has had to endure. It remains entirely neutral and indifferent to the rival claims on the State of Skopje. Whether this latter region belongs to Bulgaria or forms part of Yugoslavia either as a province, or as an autonomous state, is of no concern to the Greeks.

On Greek Macedonia, however, the answer to the aggressive proclivities of our northern neighbours will ever be an emphatic «no». Greek Macedonia belongs to Greece not only because for three thousand years it has been an organic part of it, but also because its people are so united by language, culture and sentiment with the rest of the Hellenic nation that there never will be a Greek from the northernmost part of Macedonia to Cyprus, and no Hellenic Government, whatever its political colouring, who will remain indifferent to the loss of as much as a square yard of Macedonian territory. And if it should ever happen that Macedonia is conquered again by the perennial foe of its Hellenic conscience and of its freedom, as was the case during the Balkan and two World Wars, the powerful sentiment of a united Hellenic nation would at once be roused both in Greece and abroad. It would strengthen the determination of Greece to resist and by joining forces with any anti-Slav power in the world, it would ensure that whatever gains our enemies might for a moment be able to secure, would prove costly and short-lived.

It is time our northern neighbours realized that the process of gradual expansion has reached its limit and that the limit is Greek Macedonia as at present constituted. The mere thought that Hellenism which persisted in that area through the dark, long ages when the only law which governed the fates of nations was the cruel violence of barbarian conquerors could be evicted from that cradle of the Greek race now, in this 20th century when mighty bodies of International justice protect the national rights of peoples, is totally inconceivable. The merest hint of a suspicion that the language in which man's high-

ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

est intellectual achievements, those of antiquity and of Christianity were first written and spread all over the world, the language that preserved this unique intellectual heritage throughout the Dark Ages and fed the Renaissance in Europe, that this Greek language should in this 20th century, when ethnological nonentities are able to secure their political and linguistic freedom, succumb to violence and disappear from Macedonia, the very part of the nation, which more than any other was responsible for its development as the world's educational medium, that the people of Greek Macedonia whose overwhelming majority has spoken this language for three thousand years should now be forced to educate itself in a dialect of Skopje or Beles is morally, historically and logically so preposterous that it provokes indignation verging on dark passion amongst Greeks, and can but be rejected by the conscience of any right-thinking person of any nationality.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

POSTSCRIPT

Macedonia, to-day, is a purely geographical term with no ethnological content. A distinct Macedonian nation has never existed. For the ancient Macedonians, together with other branches of the Greek Nation were merged together in the Greek world of Alexandrian, Roman and Byzantine ages and to-day the existence of such a nation cannot be conceived. As a result of historical developments the territory of ancient Macedonia is now divided between three peoples: the Greeks, the Yugoslavs and the Bulgarians and by a series of International Treaties annexed to their respective countries. This is not an unusual phenomenon. It has been repeated in other ancient lands; certainly in the Balkan peninsuala where the great ancient Thrace had a similar fate. The political and ethnological division of Macedonia was accomplished largely to the detriment of the Hellenic nation, large sections of which were abandoned to their fate behind the Bulgarian and Yugoslav frontiers where they have either been already assimilated or are rapidly becoming so. Deprived of such powerful protectors as the Russians have been for their kindred Bulgarians, the modern kingdom of Greece has not been able to free an inch of Greek territory without tremendous sacrifice of blood. Its national rights based on history and ethnology have never been given full recognition in any international treaty. She has been forced to crowd on her territory masses of refugees uprooted from their ancient homelands. And yet with unparalleled realism, Greece has agreed to recognise as final its northern frontier, in the hope that goodwill and understanding on her part would invite reciprocal gestures from its Slav neighbours; that by showing forgiveness and forgetting past injustices she would secure peace and co-operation for the future. How little this peace-loving attitude of Greece has been appreciated is shown by the experience of the Second World War. The Bulgarians followed the German invaders into eastern Macedonia and Thrace where they indulged in the wanton destruction of Greek life and property at a time when little resistance could be offered by the Greeks. To-day the State of Skopje has assumed the role of standard-bearer in the southward expansionist drive of the Slavs. In other words there can be no end to the Slavic threat against Greece.[34]

34. In the last 70 years, our Slav neighbours invaded Greece six times-in 1878,

A few Balkan scholars who have not allowed their loyalty to their race to overpower their sense of justice and historical truth, readily recognise how fortunate the Slavs have been to have the Greeks as their neighbours and to have lived near the cradle of civilisation. «Bulgaria» writes A. Balabanof[35] «is close to the source. It has always been close to it, and if it has ever achieved anything great, it owes it to that close neighbourhood. Even during our struggles against Greek supremacy, we could only defend ourselves with what we had learnt from them. Our struggle for liberation! It is as if we had fought them with their own weapons... and if our language developed so early, three or four centuries before the Western European languages, it owes no doubt, its great flexibility, strength, vitality and power of absorbtion, to its early contacts with antiquity. Our first contact with classical Greece was through Byzance. It could be said that we drank from the source three or four centuries before the rest of Europe... We Bulgarians ought to understand those truths fully well and never forget them».

The Greeks therefore assisted the Balkan Slavs in several ways. The impact of ancient Greece on them was indirect, the Byzantine influence was direct, whilst, during the modern period their national awakening could be regarded as the achievement of modern Greek culture. It may be asked accordingly what the Slavs have done in return for this generous attitude. How have they sought to repay their debt?

For to pay one's debts is the most elementary obligation of any civilised nation or person. The answer to this question quite simply is: with rivers of blood and tears. They have plundered, murdered, black--mailed and taken as hostages the people to whom they owe a considerable part of their territories, a substantial portion of their blood and the whole of their civilisation. It is with a feeling of bitterness that the Greek nation reflects on the need which has been imposed upon them by the treachery of the Slavs, to conduct a perennial struggle of survival against nations which received nothing but good from Hellas.

But the Greeks have not won a place in history solely as creators of civilisation. They have also distinguished themselves as defenders of freedom. Aeschylus considered the fact that he had participated in the battle of Marathon a higher merit even than his splendid poetry.

1903, 1913, 1915, 1941, 1947 - and pillaged, devastated, burned, slaughtered, abducted Greek populations and material goods. All six times Greece had to sacrifice her youth to repel them. See Ch. Naltsas ref. p. 14.

35. *Alex. Balabanof*: Bulgaria and Classical Culture (Transl. by *N. P. Andriotis*, Nea Estia, 22, 1937 p. 975).

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

Byzance for a thousand years fought and won «victories against barbarians».

The modern Hellenic nation struggled single-handed for its liberation during the ten years of its war of independence and by subsequent wars succeeded in freeing most of its unredeemed brethren. How little must the Slavs know the firmness of our determination if they can hope that the Greeks have kept this exquisite, glorious, unparalleled, beloved land by blood and tears for forty centuries only to present with it the Skopje pseudo-Macedonians of yesterday!

To the Greeks we can say that despite the gravity of the threat presented by the Slavs, they can look forward with optimism to the future of that part of the nation whose sweat fertilises Greek Macedonia to-day.

To the Slavs of Skopje who by systematic falsification of historical evidence and by the deliberate misrepresentation of current events, hope to inspire their people with aggressive attitudes so that they will take any future opportunity to invade Greek territories, we will say they are sadly mistaken. Faithful to their history and cultural tradition, the Greeks will fight to recover their lands, no matter how often conquered. And as we in Greece appreciate Yugoslavia's friendship, we will say to the Yugoslavs that it is time for them to put an end to the absurd and infuriating campaign against Greek Macedonia, the Macedonia which is, has always been and will ever be, Greek.

Finally, to those foreign scholars who show excessive partiality for the non-existant rights of the Slavs in Greek Macedonia, we must recommend that they reserve some of their respect for the rights of that nation which created, defended and spread human civilisation all over the world and now experiences the bitterness of receiving black ingratitude in return for its gifts.

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ
ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ